

the provisions of the Oil Pollution Act, 1924; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 13170. A bill to study the advisability of establishing an International Development Corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 13171. A bill to permit the mailing by nonprofit organizations under the third-class bulk and mail provisions of title 39, United States Code, of circulars and pamphlets constituting notice of bingo and similar contests held by such organizations in States where such contests are lawful, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 13172. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 13173. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 13174. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 13175. A bill to amend the Nurse Training Act of 1964 to provide for increased assistance to hospital diploma schools of nursing; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. BOLTON (for herself, Mr. KIRWAN, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. AYRES, Mr. BETTS, Mr. BOW, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CLANCY, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. HARSHA, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. MCCULLOCH, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. MOSHER, Mr. STANTON, Mr. TAFT, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WHALEN, and Mr. WYLIE):

H.R. 13176. A bill to amend the acts of February 1, 1826, and February 20, 1833, to authorize the State of Ohio to use the proceeds from the sale of certain lands for educational purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 13177. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FALLON (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. BOGGS):

H.R. 13178. A bill to provide more effectively for the regulation of the use of, and for the preservation of safety and order within, the U.S. Capitol buildings and the U.S. Capitol Grounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 13179. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to provide food and medical services on an emergency basis to prevent human suffering or loss of life; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 13180. A bill to limit the quantity of baseball and softball gloves and mitts which may be imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H.R. 13181. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 13182. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a 20-percent, across-the-board benefit increase (with

a minimum retirement annuity of \$70 a month) and subsequent increases based on rises in the cost of living, and to finance the cost of these changes out of the general revenues; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RARICK:

H.R. 13183. A bill to provide criminal penalties for certain travel under a U.S. passport in violation of certain passport restrictions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 13184. A bill to assure the purity and quality of all imported dairy products for the purpose of promoting the dairy industry and protecting the public health; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 13185. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.J. Res. 849. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.J. Res. 850. Joint resolution in opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WIGGINS:

H.J. Res. 851. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 852. Joint resolution to call upon the President of the United States to promote voluntary neighborhood action crusades by communities to rally law-abiding urban dwellers in preventing riots; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H. Con. Res. 513. Concurrent resolution requiring appropriate committees of the Congress to consider and report whether further congressional action is desirable in respect to U.S. policies in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 13186. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Pacino Blancorosso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, our Father, whose still, small voice invites us to turn aside from the feverish ways of the world and whose tender love bids us find our strength in Thee: We are conscious as we bow at this altar of Thy grace that if we live a life of prayer Thou are present everywhere. Amid the draining duties of these de-

manding days, by the spiritual resources that are found in Thee alone, may our jaded spirits be refreshed and our souls restored.

Endow and enrich Thy servants in this National Body with wisdom and purity of motive in the ministry of public affairs. Make them worthy of the Nation's trust in these days so fraught with destiny.

We pledge our hopes, our faith, our lives, That freedom shall not die;  
We pray Thy guidance, strength, and grace;

Almighty God on high.

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 26, 1967, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

## NOMINATIONS

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of Commerce, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING  
SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE OF MAJOR AIRLINE  
DECLARES WHOLE INDUSTRY  
WILL HAVE TO SUPPORT NEW  
SHORT-HAUL CONCEPT—STOL  
CRAFT WOULD OBVIATE USE  
OF LONG-HAUL JETS IN  
SHORT-HAUL PATTERNS  
AND MISSIONS—SENATOR  
RANDOLPH OPTIMISTIC  
THAT AIRPORT CRISIS  
RETHINKING WILL BRING  
RESTRUCTURING OF  
SOLUTIONS AT LESS COST

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, when a top airline executive declares that it is time for the industry to begin using new short-haul transportation aircraft because rising ground costs are making conventional means uneconomic, perhaps our country is on the verge of a breakthrough and possibly has at least a partial solution for the airport crisis.

Arthur D. Lewis, senior vice president and general manager of Eastern Airlines—one of the major trunkline carriers—is reported to have said in a speech in New York City last week that the airline industry will have to get behind new short-haul concepts. He forthrightly asserted that the industry of which his company is a significant part "must move aggressively to develop STOL—short takeoff and landing—aircraft and STOL landing strips" to offset costs which he sees continuing upward. In fact, Mr. Lewis said:

Ultimately, Eastern's shuttle and other similar short-haul operations must be performed by efficient STOL airplanes.

He declared, however, that before this can happen, the airline industry as a whole "is going to have to place STOL high on its list of priorities and aggressively push it."

Mr. President, I believe it is incumbent on the airline industry to place a high priority on the STOL's—and on the aerospace equipment manufacturers to respond—because domestic aviation in this country has reached a new crossroad.

Despite the efficiency of jet aircraft, substantial percentages of the savings that had been expected by converting from propeller craft to jets are being dissipated by other factors. In fact, it was Eastern Airlines' vice president and gen-

eral manager—Lewis—who said that flight costs are declining as the efficient jets go into service, but these savings are being offset by the costs of delays due to congestion, landing fees, and ground servicing. According to one account I read, Mr. Lewis noted that placing a jet on Eastern's afternoon flight from Boston to Philadelphia had reduced the line's haul cost by 34 percent, but ground-handling expenses, airport congestion, and uneconomic operations below cruising altitude were up 27 percent, and the result has been that the jet cost per passenger for the trip is only 5 percent less than the propeller cost 2 years ago.

A Federal Aviation Administration spokesman, George P. Bates, Director of the FAA Aircraft Development Activities, was quoted by William Reddig, Jr., Washington Star business writer, in last Sunday's issue as having said that V/STOL's are both technically and economically practicable—V/STOL's which become airborne in less than 1,500 feet of runway, compared to more than 5,000 feet needed by the big jets. That interview produced the further significant information that design concepts also call for the V/STOL planes to carry up to 120 passengers, cruise at 500 miles an hour, and land at speeds as slow as 60 miles an hour.

Mr. President, I consider these developments and these data to be significant because studies are said to show that V/STOL airplanes could be operated in landing patterns separate from the high-speed jets, with both coming down at the same time. And, perhaps, it could mean utilization of the high-speed, long-haul jets almost exclusively between the major gateways and use of the V/STOL craft in the short-haul patterns that feed into the major gateways. It even is indicated to mean the use of V/STOL craft for the short hauls between the more closely spaced major gateways such as those along the eastern seaboard—Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Newark-New York, and Boston. And it could mean, indeed, that some existing airports in short-haul market areas, such as in my home State of West Virginia, are being placed prematurely in the obsolete category. Indeed, this could be a truly important development in domestic aviation.

These are signs, too, that the heartland communities of America, as well as the closely spaced major gateways, will be served in the future with fast—500 miles per hour—convenient—through use of existing or even less costly to build small and medium size airports—and economically feasible—up to 120-passenger capacity planes—scheduled airline service.

And this is an indication that the progressive trunkline carriers are not going to seek to abandon service or seek to vacate their certificates of convenience and necessity to the small and medium size airports they now serve.

Mr. President, I feel that the airlines recognize their responsibilities to halt the proliferation of obsolescence of airports growing out of the expansion of their stretched jet fleets. This forced obsolescence is economic foolishness. And the

funds are not available in sufficient amounts to make huge investments in facilities that might, in the final analysis, be airports which might be oversized to the needs of the communities and oversized for the types of equipment which would use them 90 percent or more of the time.

A number of authorities have been subscribing to the opinion that \$6 billion will be required by 1975 to keep our country's airports ahead of future traffic demands. I hope such a huge estimated requirement can be shrunk substantially to a more realistic requirement in fact. And I believe airline utilization of V/STOL equipment in the short-haul pattern will significantly reduce airport construction needs and costs and thus free more funds for air traffic safety and other types of equipment and facilities at airports to mitigate against the "airport glut" which we all know exists—including passenger, baggage, freight, and ground vehicular traffic congestion at the airport terminals.

In earlier communications and remarks in this forum, I have urged that our Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation and our Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Aviation ascertain what is delaying progress in the development, production, and commercial utilization in this country of the short-field-runway jet aircraft so vitally needed. I believe this continues to be a pressure point of inquiry because it is my judgment that the advent of STOL, aircraft as short-haul equipment to augment the airlines' present fleets dominated by the long-haul stretched jets will be helpful in the search for solutions to the so-called airport crisis. And, as I have pointed out, one of the high-ranking airline executives has declared within the past week that the STOL equipment will be necessary within the industry "because rising ground costs are making conventional means uneconomic."

I have talked and communicated with the able chairman of our Subcommittee on Aviation, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], and with the diligent chairman of our Committee on Commerce, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], concerning these subjects and I feel reassured. I have a letter from the Aviation Subcommittee chairman in which he informed me that he "heartily agrees" with my belief that we should not lose sight of the needs of smaller airports in our great desire to fund the supersonic transport—SST. And I endorse as correct his cogent observation in his letter that—

The burgeoning traffic in the large metropolitan hub airports would rapidly withdraw away if the small airports which feed the traffic into them are not properly equipped.

Mr. President, I am optimistic that there is emerging a rethinking of the problems and the elements of the airport crisis in America—and it is conceivable that there is in the making a complete restructuring of the solutions to the airport crisis as more and more it will be realized that long-haul stretched jets are not the true answers to the short-haul patterns of air traffic—of which there are many in this country. I agree with



and commend the declaration by senior vice president, and general manager, Lewis, of Eastern Airlines, that "the airline industry will have to get behind new short-haul concepts," and I believe it is encouraging that he declared:

Ultimately, Eastern's shuttle and other similar short-haul operations must be performed by efficient STOL airplanes.

This is especially significant because, if accepted and repeated by other major domestic trunkline carriers, it can mean much to the smaller and medium-size airports and the communities served by them throughout the United States. I believe it can, indeed, do much to take the crisis element out of the so-called airport crisis.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on September 26, 1967, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 636) for the relief of Mrs. Chin Shee Shiu.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 12120) to assist courts, correctional systems, and community agencies to prevent, treat, and control juvenile delinquency; to support research and training efforts in the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency; and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 12120) to assist courts, correctional systems, and community agencies to prevent, treat, and control juvenile delinquency; to support research and training efforts in the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency; and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS— WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the name of Hyun

Sohn Nak from a report relating to aliens whose deportation has been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on October 1, 1966 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred or ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio (for himself and Mr. LAUSCHE):

S. 2471. A bill to amend the acts of February 1, 1826, and February 20, 1833, to authorize the State of Ohio to use the proceeds from the sale of certain lands for educational purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2472. A bill for the relief of Mr. Corrado De Musso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 2473. A bill for the relief of Tung Kwai Lam, Chun Yi Tong, and Tik Shun Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2474. A bill relating to the prohibition of riots and incitement to riot in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 2475. A bill to provide for State regulatory jurisdiction over natural resources and services, produced, transported and consumed solely within a single State or off the shore of a single State; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mrs. SMITH (for herself, Mr.

AIKEN, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. INOUE, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PRUTY, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. THURMOND, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 2476. A bill to amend title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to establish more effective criteria for a finding of serious injury to domestic industry as a result of concessions granted under trade agreements, to make mandatory the findings of the Tariff Commission with respect to the necessity for tariff adjustment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mrs. SMITH when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 2477. A bill for the relief of Dr. Fang Luke Chiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL:

S. 2478. A bill to incorporate the Junior Naval Cadets of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. PELL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 2479. A bill to authorize the appropriation of \$200 million for a U.S. contribution to Multilateral Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 2480. A bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats irrigation project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr.

BROOKE, Mr. COTTON, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SMATHERS, and Mr. RISBICOFF):

S. 2481. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities; to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities; and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

#### TO PRINT ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN HEARINGS OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 46); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Special Committee on Aging five thousand five hundred additional copies each of parts one and two of its hearings of the Ninetieth Congress, first session, entitled "Retirement and the Individual".*

#### RESOLUTION

#### TO REQUEST THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE TO UNDERTAKE A STUDY OF WAGE AREAS

Mr. PELL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 171) to request the Department of Defense to undertake a study of wage areas used to determine wage rates of its employees engaged in recognized trades and crafts, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. PELL, which appears under a separate heading.)

# ANTIRIOT BILL FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the punishment of individuals who riot or incite others to riot in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, every Member of the Senate is acutely aware of the crisis of lawlessness that faces our Nation. Rioting, burning, looting, and killing have struck our major cities from coast to coast. Fortunately, so far, the Nation's Capital has been spared any major incidents. But we would be shortsighted to the point of foolhardiness not to recognize the danger of inaction.

The control of crime and lawlessness is primarily the responsibility of State and local governments. Only when these problems reach tragic proportions can the Federal Government, with the consent of local authorities, take a hand.

This is not the case in the District of Columbia, a Federal City. Federal jurisdiction exists and, under present governmental organization, the Congress has a direct responsibility in public safety under law and order.

There are many things that must be done to put an end to riots and their causes. Meanwhile, however, our Nation must meet the crisis of lawlessness head on by supporting and enforcing strict laws and stern punishment in the area of lawlessness.

As I have stated repeatedly in recent public statements:

We cannot tolerate lawlessness.

We cannot be permissive about violence.

We cannot accept excuses for looting and killing.

Mr. President, there are no excuses, no justifications, no provocations to explain away rioting and burning, and looting and killing. These criminal actions are an outrage against civilized life, an affront to democracy, an insult to law and order. They are born of contempt for law and thrive on chaos.

No nation, no matter how enlightened, can endure criminal violence. If we cannot control it we are admitting to the world and to ourselves that our laws are no more than a facade that crumbles when the winds of crisis rise.

It is imperative that we turn full attention to the problems of ignorance, poverty and social injustice that have nurtured violence. And I should note what is often forgotten—that the past two Congresses have made great strides toward correcting these problems. But we cannot work on these problems intelligently under the threat of more violence. We cannot consider the causes if we fail to control the unlawful effects.

There are those who deride sterner laws and increased police protection. They say these measures are not the answer, that we must turn first to eradicating the conditions that cause the violence.

I say in return that there cannot be any answers if we do not first control lawlessness. We are a nation of laws. Without them we are nothing more here than philosophical debaters. Our decisions would have no force.

I will be happy to debate the philosophy of lawlessness after we once again have law.

The bill I introduce today has the recommendation of the administration behind it. It is designed to fill a critical gap in District of Columbia law by specifically outlawing riots and the incitement to riot and by imposing fines and imprisonment for violators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2474) relating to the prohibition of riots and incitement to riot in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## PRESERVATION OF STATE JURISDICTION OVER NATURAL RESOURCES PRODUCED AND CONSUMED WITHIN ONE STATE OR ADJACENT WATERS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for State regulatory jurisdiction over natural resources and services produced, transported, and consumed solely within a single State or off the shore of a single State. I ask unanimous consent that a statement stating the purpose of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2475) to provide for State regulatory jurisdiction over natural resources and services, produced, transported and consumed solely within a single State or off the shore of a single State, introduced by Mr. Long of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The statement presented by Mr. LONG of Louisiana is as follows:

### STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PRESERVE STATE JURISDICTION OVER NATURAL RESOURCES PRODUCED AND CONSUMED WITHIN ONE STATE OR ADJACENT WATERS

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to preserve state regulatory jurisdiction over natural resources and services produced, transported and consumed solely within a single state or in the waters bordering a single state. Some federal regulatory agencies have asserted jurisdiction over transactions that, by any common sense test, are solely intrastate. Attempts have been made to justify the asserted federal jurisdiction under the color of artificial legal theories and mechanical engineering tests under which any minuscule relation of intrastate activities to interstate commerce is argued to confer federal jurisdiction. The proposed legislation would exempt from federal regulation certain of these activities that do not have a substantial nexus to the citizens of more than one state, if the activities are subject to state regulation and state regulation is being exercised.

The proposed legislation is needed to prevent unnecessary and wasteful duplication by federal and state regulators. Moreover, certain Supreme Court cases have held that the power of states to provide for the conservation and taxation of natural resources diminishes in direct relation to the increase

of federal regulatory jurisdiction over such natural resources.<sup>1</sup> Thus, the proposed legislation would increase also the ability of states to conserve natural resources and to prevent the dilution of the state tax base.

A precedent for the proposed legislation is the Hinshaw amendment to the Natural Gas Act,<sup>2</sup> which exempted from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction persons receiving natural gas in or at the boundary of a state for consumption within the state. Since that amendment exempted federal regulation with respect to a commodity which had been transported through other states and thus, by any practical test, was clearly in interstate commerce, it did not present as strong a case for exemption as does the proposed legislation.

It should be emphasized that the proposed legislation will neither necessarily raise nor lower prices charged for regulated commodities. This is well illustrated by one recent case in which jurisdiction by the Louisiana Public Service Commission was denied, and FPC jurisdiction upheld, over sales of gas produced in Louisiana and bordering waters for consumption in the Florida Parish area of Louisiana, even though the price permitted by Louisiana would have been lower than the price prescribed by the Federal Power Commission.<sup>3</sup> It should also be emphasized that the proposed legislation would apply to a broad range of commodities and services, and that it would apply to interior and shoreline states alike.

In transactions directly and substantially affecting Louisiana citizens alone, surely the citizens of Louisiana are better served by Louisiana regulators than by federal regulators living a thousand miles from Louisiana, unfamiliar with her problems and out of touch with her needs and aspirations. Of course, the same principle applies to the citizens of California or Iowa or Maine. The preservation of a meaningful federal system is dependent upon the enactment of legislation such as that proposed.

## AMENDMENT OF TITLE III OF THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT OF 1962

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise for the purpose of introducing a bill on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the junior

<sup>1</sup> *Michigan-Wisconsin Pipe Line Co. v. Calvert et al.*, 347 U.S. 157, 74 S. Ct. 396 (1964); *Natural Gas Pipeline Company of America v. Panoma Corporation*, 349 U.S. 44, 7 S. Ct. 576. See also, *Deep South Oil Company of Texas v. FPC*, 247 F.2d 882 (5th Cir., 1957) at 892, 899 (dissenting opinion).

<sup>2</sup> Adding section 1(c) to the Act; 15 U.S.C.A. 717(c).

<sup>3</sup> *Louisiana Public Service Commission v. FPC*, 359 F.2d 525 (5th Cir., 1966), affirming FPC Opinions 401 and 401A, CP 62-161. FPC Opinion 401, p. 8, fn. 9, states that the rates prescribed by Louisiana would have been 9¢ per Mcf lower than FPC rates.



Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUE], the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHEL], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], and the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

This bill is actually a revision of S. 1891, which I and others introduced earlier this year, because the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 have not provided any means or procedure for significant relief or protection of domestic industry—being so weak and meaningless that such industries as the shoe industry, the textile industry, and other industries have not even troubled to apply for the invoking of such weak and meaningless provisions.

Subsequent to the introduction of S. 1891, representatives of some industries suggested specific revisions of S. 1891. Their principal suggestion was that such protective legislation should be aimed at more than the measurement of a stabilized annual output but instead related to protection of domestic industry from losing a substantial portion of their growth to increased imports from abroad.

Consequently, they proposed that S. 1891 be revised to:

First, require the Tariff Commission to find serious injury or threat thereof to the domestic industry seeking escape clause relief, or a firm seeking adjustment assistance, when the Commission determines that the ratio of imports to domestic production exceeded 10 percent during the calendar year immediately preceding the initiation of the Tariff Commission investigation; and

Second, require the Tariff Commission to find unemployment or underemployment or threat thereof with respect to workers seeking adjustment assistance when the Tariff Commission determines that increased imports have contributed, or are contributing, in any substantial degree to a decline amounting to 5 percent or more in man hours or wages paid to direct labor employed by such firm or subdivision.

These proposals are very meritorious and so they have been incorporated in this proposed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a detailed explanation of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanation of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2476) to amend title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to establish more effective criteria for a finding of serious injury to domestic industry as a result of concessions granted under trade agreements, to make mandatory the findings of the Tariff Commission with respect to the necessity for

tariff adjustment, and for other purposes, introduced by Mrs. SMITH (for herself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The explanation presented by Mrs. SMITH is as follows:

#### EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

This is an explanation of the changes which would be made in existing law (the Trade Expansion Act of 1962) by the bill.

#### I. THE BILL

*The bill is not special legislation for any one or more domestic industries but rather for all domestic industries desperately needing help.*

The bill would protect domestic industries which, though able to increase their annual output, are nevertheless losing most of their growth to increased cheap-labor imports from abroad.

The bill recognizes that conditions which deny adequate growth can destroy an industry as surely, if not as quickly, as conditions which cause a static or declining level of volume.

The bill amends clauses 301(b)(3) and (c)(3) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to require a finding of serious injury or threat thereof to a domestic industry whenever the Tariff Commission determines that imports exceeded 10 percent of domestic production during the calendar year immediately preceding the initiation of the Tariff Commission's investigation.

Clause (c)(3) would also be amended to require a finding of unemployment or underemployment or threat thereof whenever the Tariff Commission determines that increased imports have contributed, or are contributing in any substantial degree, to a decline, amounting to 5 percent or more in man hours or wages paid, of the direct labor employed by firms concerned.

#### *Tariff adjustment mandatory, not discretionary*

Under the bill, if the Tariff Commission makes the necessary finding of serious injury or threat thereof, it is mandatory upon the President to provide tariff adjustment for the affected domestic industry and to authorize firms in such industry and groups of workers in such industry to apply for adjustment assistance under chapters 2 and 3 of title III.

In addition, the bill makes the Tariff Commission's finding as to the amount of increase, in, or imposition, of, any duty or other import restriction which is necessary to prevent or remedy the serious injury or threat thereof to the domestic industry binding upon the President. That is, the President would have to provide the tariff adjustment which the Tariff Commission finds necessary to prevent or remedy the serious injury or threat thereof.

Under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, a domestic article is considered "directly competitive with" an imported article at an earlier or later stage of processing, if the importation of the imported article has an economic effect on producers of the domestic article comparable to the effect of importation of articles in the same stage of processing as the domestic article. For this purpose, an unprocessed article is considered to be at an earlier stage of processing.

#### *Unprocessed article*

The bill adds a provision to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to provide that, in determining whether an unprocessed article (i.e., a raw material) is directly competitive with an imported article at a later stage of processing (i.e., a finished or semi-finished imported article), the Tariff Commission shall weigh carefully, among other factors, the relationship of the unprocessed article and the im-

ported article, the number of processes involved, and the number and volume of secondary materials required.

#### II. EXISTING LAW

Title III of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 contains the procedures whereby domestic industries may seek relief from injury caused by tariff concessions granted under trade agreements entered into by the United States. The procedure contained in title III applies whether the tariff concessions were granted under authority of the 1962 Act or of prior law.

#### *Finding of injury*

The granting of tariff adjustment as provided in title III requires a finding by the United States Tariff Commission that "as a result in major part of concessions granted under trade agreements, an article is being imported into the United States in such increased quantities as to cause, or threaten to cause, serious injury to the domestic industry producing an article which is like or directly competitive with the imported article."

A similar finding by the Tariff Commission is required for a firm to seek adjustment assistance under chapter 2 of title III or for a group of workers to seek adjustment assistance under chapter 3 of title III.

#### *Presidential action discretionary, not mandatory*

Under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, if the Tariff Commission makes the necessary finding of serious injury or threat thereof, the President may provide tariff adjustment for the affected domestic industry, and may authorize firms in such industry and groups of workers in such industry to apply for adjustment assistance under chapters 2 and 3 of title III, respectively. It is discretionary with the President as to whether he takes any or all of the action permissible.

If the Tariff Commission makes the necessary findings of serious injury or threat thereof, it is required by the 1962 Act also to find and report to the President the amount of the increase in, or imposition of, any duty or other import restriction which is necessary to prevent or remedy the serious injury or threat to the domestic industry.

In addition to having discretion as to whether or not to provide any tariff adjustment, the President also has discretion under the 1962 Act as to whether to provide the tariff adjustment found necessary by the Tariff Commission or to provide some other tariff adjustment.

#### *Presidential report to Congress*

The Act does provide, however, that the President must report to the Congress if he does not provide the tariff adjustment found necessary by the Tariff Commission, and the Act also provides a procedure whereby the two Houses of the Congress may, by concurrent resolution, require the imposition of the tariff adjustment found necessary by the Tariff Commission.

### INCORPORATION OF THE JUNIOR NAVAL CADETS OF AMERICA

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the incorporation of the Junior Naval Cadets of America. I introduce this legislation at the request of a distinguished constituent, Mr. Mario R. aRussillo of Johnston, R.I., who holds the rank of captain in the Junior Naval Cadets of America, and who is the commandant of the Rhode Island State Command, JNCA.

The purpose of this excellent organization is to drill and instruct young people between the ages of 12 and 18 in the tradition and science of the naval serv-

ice. My own State, with its long and honorable nautical heritage, has had a great interest in the Junior Naval Cadets from the beginning. From their origin in nearby Connecticut with only a few hundred members, the Junior Naval Cadets now claim several thousand members in a dozen States across the Nation.

Because of their growth to national status and because of the consequent need to centralize and consolidate their legal status, the Junior Naval Cadets have decided to seek a congressional charter through the legislation which I introduce today. I do hope that the excellent Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations, which is headed by the distinguished minority leader, may see fit to consider this bill favorably. I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2478) to incorporate the Junior Naval Cadets of America, introduced by Mr. PELL, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2478

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That* Rear Admiral John McCaffery, Post Office Box 725, Groton, Connecticut; Lieutenant Commander Harvey R. Berger, 31 Tudor Street, Lynn, Massachusetts; Commander Paul Palmer, Post Office Box 1594, Fort Lauderdale, Florida; Captain Mario R. aRussillo, 17 Harrington Drive, Johnston, Rhode Island; Lieutenant Charles H. Holsopple, Post Office Box 207, Broomall, Pennsylvania; Lieutenant Rose Barrett, 1222 Bellflower Avenue, SW., Canton, Ohio; Lieutenant Commander Frank Jones, in care of Post Office Box 1594, Fort Lauderdale, Florida; Lieutenant Alfred Howland, Alewine Road, Kennebunk, Maine; Commander William Golding, 20711 Van Owen Street, Conaga Park, California; Lieutenant Edmund G. Brown, 114 East 188th Street, Bronx, New York; Lieutenant Commander Ernest A. Morin, Peru, Vermont; Lieutenant Marcellino Ozuna, Junior, 5530 Gypsy Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada; and their successors, are hereby created and declared to be a body corporate by the name of the Junior Naval Cadets of America (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation") and by such name shall be known and have perpetual succession, and the powers, limitations, and restrictions herein contained.

#### COMPLETION OF ORGANIZATION

SEC. 2. The persons named in the first section of this Act shall be the incorporators of the corporation and a majority of such persons are authorized to complete the organization of the corporation by the selection of officers and employees, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, not inconsistent with this Act, and the doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purpose.

#### OBJECTS AND PURPOSES

SEC. 3. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be—

(1) to provide an organization to encourage and aid American citizens in the contribution of their efforts, services and resources in the development of our youth and in the maintenance of American superiority; and to encourage and develop, by example, the voluntary contribution of private citizens to the public welfare;

(2) to drill and instruct cadets in naval and military education, procedure and discipline; to promote the social, moral, mental and physical welfare of these cadets;

(3) to plan, carry out and maintain a schedule of youth activities including the formation of subsidiary groups or societies;

(4) to safeguard and transmit to posterity the purity and righteousness of individual freedom, to preserve our American heritage and to foster such teachings of good citizenship;

(5) to assist in charitable work of any nature deemed beneficial and to the best interests of our organization and to society and the community, as a whole, and to raise funds for carrying the same into effect by any manner allowed by the constitution and bylaws of the corporation and permitted under the laws of the respective States and under the laws and Constitution of the United States of America;

(6) to uphold and maintain the Constitution of the United States of America and all subdivisions thereunder; and

(7) to assist in maintaining law and order under the supervision and direction of existing municipal authority.

#### POWERS

SEC. 4. The corporation shall have power—

(1) to sue and be sued, complain and defend in any court of competent jurisdiction;

(2) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal;

(3) to appoint and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, managers, and agents, as its business may require, and define their authority and duties;

(4) to adopt, amend, and alter bylaws and regulations not inconsistent with the laws of the United States or any State, or the District of Columbia, in which such corporation is to operate, for the management of its property and the regulation of its affairs;

(5) to make and carry out contracts;

(6) to charge and collect membership dues, subscription fees, and receive contributions or grants of money to be devoted to the carrying out of its purposes;

(7) to take and hold by lease, gift, purchase, grant, devise, or bequest any property, real, personal, or mixed, necessary for attaining the objects and carrying into effect the purposes of the corporation, subject, however, to applicable provisions of law of any State or the District of Columbia (A) governing the amount or kind of real and personal property which may be held by or (B) otherwise limiting or controlling the ownership of real and personal property by, a corporation operating in such State, or the District of Columbia;

(8) to transfer, convey, lease, sublease, mortgage, encumber, and otherwise alienate real, personal, or mixed property;

(9) to borrow money for the purposes of the corporation, issue bonds or other evidences of indebtedness therefor, and secure the same by mortgage, deed of trust, pledge, or otherwise, subject in every case to all applicable provisions of the Federal and State laws or of the laws of the District of Columbia; and

(10) to do any and all lawful acts and things necessary and proper to carry out the objects and purposes of the corporation.

#### MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 5. Eligibility for membership in the corporation and the rights and privileges of members shall, except as provided in this Act, be determined as the constitution and bylaws of the corporation may provide.

#### NATIONAL BOARD OF STAFF OFFICERS

SEC. 6. (a) Upon enactment of this Act, the membership of the initial national board of staff officers of the corporation shall consist of the persons named in the first section of this Act.

(b) Except as provided in the preceding

subsection, the national board of staff officers shall consist of such number, shall be selected in such manner (including the filling of vacancies), shall hold such meetings, and shall serve for such term as may be prescribed in the constitution and the bylaws of the corporation.

(c) The national board of staff officers shall be the governing board of the corporation and shall have such powers, duties, and responsibilities as may be prescribed in the constitution and bylaws of the corporation.

(d) The national board of staff officers may establish an executive board and committees to exercise such powers as may be prescribed in the bylaws.

#### OFFICERS

SEC. 7. The officers of the corporation shall be those provided in the bylaws. Such officers shall be elected in such manner, for such term, and with such duties, as may be prescribed in the bylaws of the corporation.

#### PRINCIPAL OFFICE; SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AGENT

SEC. 8. (a) The principal office of the corporation shall be located in Groton, Connecticut, or in such other place as may later be determined by the national board of staff officers, but the activities of the corporation shall not be confined to that place but may be conducted throughout the United States and each territory, possession, and dependency of the United States.

(b) The corporation shall maintain at all times in the District of Columbia a designated agent authorized to accept service of process for the corporation, and notice to or service upon such agent, or mailed to the business address of such agent, shall be deemed notice to, or service upon, the corporation.

#### USE OF INCOME; LIMITATION ON MAKING LOANS

SEC. 9. (a) No part of the income or assets of the corporation shall inure to any member, officer, employee or member of the national board of staff officers, executive board, or committees, or be distributable to any such person during the life of the corporation or upon its dissolution or final liquidation. Nothing in this subsection, however, shall be construed to prevent the payment of reasonable compensation to officers of the corporation or reimbursement for actual expenses in amounts approved by the corporation's national board of staff officers.

(b) The corporation shall not make loans to its members, officers, employees, or members of the national board of staff officers, executive board, or committees. Any member of the national board of staff officers who votes for or assents to the making of such loan, and any officer who participates in the making of such a loan, shall be jointly and severally liable to the corporation for the amount of such a loan until the repayment thereof.

#### LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS AND AGENTS

SEC. 10. The corporation shall be liable for the acts of its officers, agents, managers, and employees when acting within the scope of their authority or employment.

#### NONPOLITICAL NATURE OF CORPORATION

SEC. 11. The corporation and its officers and members of the national board of staff officers as such, shall not contribute to or otherwise support or assist any political party or candidate for office.

#### PROHIBITION AGAINST ISSUANCE OF STOCK OR PAYMENT OF DIVIDENDS

SEC. 12. The corporation shall have no power to issue any shares of stock nor to declare or pay any dividends.

#### BOOKS AND RECORDS; INSPECTION

SEC. 13. The corporation shall keep correct and complete books and records of account. It shall also keep minutes of the proceedings



of its members and national board of staff officers, and executive board and committees authorized by the national board of staff officers. The corporation shall keep at its principal office a record of the names and addresses of its members entitled to vote. All books and records of the corporation may be inspected by any member, or his agent or attorney, for any proper purpose, at any reasonable time.

#### AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 14. (a) The accounts of the corporation shall be audited annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified public accountants or independent licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State or other political subdivision thereof. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts of the corporation are normally kept. All books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and all other papers, things, or property belonging to or in use by the corporation and necessary to facilitate the audit shall be made available to the person or persons conducting the audit; and full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositories, fiscal agents, and custodians shall be afforded to such person or persons.

(b) A report of such audit shall be made by the corporation to the President of the United States and to the Congress not later than six months following the close of the fiscal year for which the audit is made. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and include such statements as are necessary to present fairly the corporation's assets and liabilities, surplus or deficit, with an analysis of the changes therein during the year, supplemented in reasonable detail by a statement of the corporation's income and expenses during the year, together with the independent auditor's opinion of those statements. The report shall not be printed as a public document.

#### USE OF ASSETS ON DISSOLUTION OR LIQUIDATION

SEC. 15. Upon dissolution or final liquidation of the corporation, after discharge or satisfaction of all outstanding obligations and liabilities, the remaining assets of the corporation may be distributed in accordance with the determination of the national board or staff officers of the corporation and in compliance with this Act the bylaws of the corporation, and all other Federal and State laws and laws of the District of Columbia applicable thereto.

#### EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO NAME, INSIGNIA, EMBLEMS, SEALS, AND BADGES

SEC. 16. The corporation shall have the sole and exclusive right to use and allow or refuse to others the use of the name "Junior National Cadets of America", and to have and to use such distinctive insignia, emblems, seals, and badges, descriptive or designating marks, and words or phrases, as may be required to carry out the purposes of the corporation. No powers or privileges hereby granted shall, however, interfere or conflict with established or vested rights.

#### RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO AMEND OR REPEAL CHARTER

SEC. 17. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is hereby expressly reserved to the Congress.

#### AUTHORIZATION OF AN APPROPRIATION FOR A U.S. CONTRIBUTION TO MULTILATERAL SPECIAL FUNDS OF THE ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as acting chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I introduce, by request, a bill to authorize the appropri-

ation of \$200 million for a U.S. contribution to Multilateral Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Department of the Treasury.

I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comment.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when it is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proposed bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2479) to authorize the appropriation of \$200 million for a U.S. contribution to Multilateral Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### S. 2479

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the sense of the Congress that—*

(a) The United States national interests would be served by an expanded cooperation in a multilateral effort for the acceleration of economic and social progress of the developing nations of Asia and that this is important to the achievement of peace and stability in that region;

(b) Such progress can best be advanced by the continued cooperation of regional and other interested countries;

(c) The Asian Development Bank, established as a result of Asian initiative, is well designed to formulate and execute cooperative programs that will promote regional development;

(d) The United States should participate with other interested contributing countries in financing, through Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank, regional programs in areas such as agriculture, transportation, Mekong development and other priority areas, on terms which are not appropriate to the Bank's ordinary lending activities;

(e) In participating in such activities of the Bank, the President should ensure that the contribution of the United States represents a minority of the total contributions of all contributing countries, that it is used in a manner designed to safeguard the balance of payments of the United States, and that it is devoted to meeting the priority needs of the countries of the area.

SEC. 2. In order that the United States may respond to Asian initiatives and join in a multilateral effort to provide assistance to the developing nations of Asia consistent with the provisions of section 1, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President without fiscal year limitation \$200 million which shall remain available until expended for United States participation in Special Funds of the Asian Development Bank.

#### PROTECTING INDIAN RIGHTS AT MICHAUD FLATS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of August 31, 1954, pro-

viding for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats irrigation project, in Idaho.

The bill is introduced at the request of the Department of the Interior. It is identical with a bill which passed the Senate in the 88th Congress, but received no House action.

This is a very simple measure, Mr. President, and its purpose is to add a new subsection to the authorization act which will facilitate the execution of contracts for the delivery of water to individual Indian allotments.

Much of this project is on Indian land. Contracts have been signed by non-Indian landowners, but difficulty has been experienced in obtaining the signatures of all landowners of Indian allotments. This is due mostly to the fractionated heirship status of the land and the difficulty of procuring the addresses of minority interest landowners. Many of these heirs are scattered throughout the United States.

The amendment would authorize the Secretary of Interior to execute a contract on behalf of any Indian holding an individual interest in trust or restricted land where the contract has been signed by or on behalf of a majority of the interests in the land. The Secretary may also execute the contract on behalf of any Indian who is a minor, who has been adjudicated non compos mentis, whose ownership interest in a decedent's estate has not been determined, or who cannot be located.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal from the Department of the Interior and the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2480) to amend the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats irrigation project, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### S. 2480

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats irrigation project in the State of Idaho, is amended by adding thereto a new subsection (c) as follows:*

"(c) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to execute a contract required by subsection (b) of this section on behalf of any Indian who owns an undivided trust or restricted interest in a tract of land when (1) the contract has been signed by or on behalf of the holders of a majority interest in the land, or (2) the Indian is a minor, or (3) the Indian has been adjudicated non compos mentis, or (4) the Indian's ownership interest in a decedent's estate has not been determined, or (5) the Indian cannot be located by the Secretary after a reasonable and diligent search and the giving of notice by publication."

The letter presented by Mr. CHURCH is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Washington, D.C., August 22, 1967.  
Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
President of the Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of a proposed bill "To amend the Act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), providing for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Michaud Flats Irrigation project."

We recommend that the bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

The Act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1026), provides for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Michaud Flats Project under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation and reauthorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Michaud Division of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Construction on the Indian reservation was originally authorized by the Act of February 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1061).

Section 3 of the 1954 Act provides as follows:

"Sec. 3. (a) To aid in the development of not more than twenty-one thousand acres of irrigable land in the Michaud division of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, as heretofore authorized by the Act of February 4, 1931 (46 Stat. 1061), and hereby reauthorized for construction, operation, and maintenance without regard to the provisions of said Act, the Secretary is authorized—

"(1) to reserve for the benefit of those lands when needed, but without prejudice to the interim use thereof for other purposes proper under reclamation laws, eighty-three thousand and nine hundred acre-feet of storage capacity in Palisades Reservoir and forty-seven thousand and seven hundred acre-feet of that portion of the storage capacity in American Falls Reservoir which was set aside for lands in the Michaud area generally by section 3 of the Act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1083); and

"(2) to account for the return of so much of the cost of said development (including the cost of the aforesaid storage space in Palisades and American Falls Reservoirs) as the Secretary finds cannot be repaid by the water users on terms substantially similar to those provided in section 2 of this Act, except for the application of the provisions of the Act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564), and the Act of March 1, 1907 (34 Stat. 1015, 1024), which are specifically made applicable to the project authorized by this section and Indian lands susceptible of irrigation under said project, by application of net power revenues of the Palisades project and any developments combined therewith for payout purposes under the provisions of the second sentence of section 2 of the Act of September 30, 1950, after payout thereof is accomplished pursuant to law.

"(b) Construction of works to serve the Michaud division lands shall be undertaken only if, in consideration thereof and of the additional benefits authorized in the preceding sentence of this section, such appropriate arrangements as may be required in the circumstances are first made, by contract or otherwise, with respect to a water supply for said lands which, among other things— (italic supplied)

"(1) limit that supply to the yield of the space in Palisades and American Falls Reservoirs as hereinbefore set forth and to that obtained by the pumping of ground water in an average annual amount of not more than twenty-two thousand and four hundred acre-feet; and

"(2) consent to a priority in time and right

in such beneficial consumptive uses of the waters of the Snake River, and its tributaries, as are established under the laws of the State of Idaho prior to the date of this Act as against any use of the waters arising on or flowing through the Fort Hall Bottoms within the Fort Hall Indian Reservation, including, but not limited to, the intercepted flow of Ross Fork Creek, the Portneuf River below Pocatello, Big Jimmy Creek, Big Spring Creek, and Clear Creek, for the irrigation of the lands of the Michaud division of the Fort Hall Indian Reservation."

It will be noted from the italic lines of the Act that prior to the undertaking of construction a contract or other arrangement must be made with respect to a water supply for the Michaud Division lands. The contract or other arrangement must be appropriate under the circumstances, and must limit the water supply for such lands and consent to certain priorities in time and use.

The requirement with respect to tribal lands has been satisfied by tribal resolution and ordinance. With respect to allotted lands, both the consent requirement and the limitation of water supply requirement call for a contractual agreement of the landowners. Contract forms have been prepared and executed by most of the landowners. In some instances, however, difficulty has been experienced in obtaining the necessary signatures of all the Indians involved in the land. The failure to obtain signatures of some of the minority interest owners in the land is preventing those Indians holding a majority interest in the land, and who have executed the contracts, from sharing in the benefits that can be derived from irrigation.

The proposed bill authorized the Secretary to execute contracts on behalf of any Indian who holds an individual interest in trust or restricted land where the contract has been signed by or on behalf of holders of a majority interest in the land. It also permits the Secretary to execute contracts on behalf of those Indians who are minors, who have been adjudicated non compos mentis, whose ownership interest has not been determined, or who cannot be located. The authority is necessary to enable all of the Indian lands in the Michaud Division at the Fort Hall Indian Reservation to participate in the benefits of the irrigation project.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of the proposed legislation from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY R. ANDERSON,  
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

#### REGULATION OF CARE AND HANDLING OF LABORATORY ANIMALS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and Senators BROOKE, COTTON, KENNEDY of Massachusetts, KENNEDY of New York, McINTYRE, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, and SMATHERS, a bill to provide for the regulation of the care and handling of laboratory animals. The bill was prepared in collaboration with the Humane Society of the United States, the American Humane Society, and the New York State Medical Society.

A similar bill is being introduced in the other body by Representative PAUL ROGERS of Florida and 21 Members of that body.

The purpose of the bill is to regulate the care of animals used in medical experiments and would follow in logical sequence the law of last year which covered laboratory animals but specifically excludes those used in research.

Mr. President, I wish to make one additional comment. I understand that considerable opposition is being directed with respect to this matter on the ground that in some way it preempts the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture. I have just heard about this recently and rather than hold up the introduction of the bill I wish to assure everyone who has that interest, that in the consideration of the bill, which will be very soon, I hope we will consider this matter carefully.

Mr. President, I assure anyone interested that the matter will have the most considered attention along that line.

#### REQUEST FOR A BILL TO LIE ON THE TABLE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from New York has introduced S. 2481, the Humane Laboratory Animal Treatment Act of 1967. I ask unanimous consent that it lie on the table for an indefinite period of time, until we can discuss the matter with the Senator from New York. This request is not made for the purpose of cosponsorship. It involves jurisdiction of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2481) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide special assistance for the improvement of laboratory animal research facilities; to establish standards for the humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals in departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States and by recipients of grants, awards, and contracts from the United States; to encourage the study and improvement of the care, handling, and treatment and the development of methods for minimizing pain and discomfort of laboratory animals used in biomedical activities; and to otherwise assure humane care, handling, and treatment of laboratory animals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and by unanimous consent, was ordered to lie on the table.

#### AREA WAGE SURVEY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a proposed Senate resolution which would direct the Department of Defense to take immediate action so as to insure an equitable rate of pay for certain of its civilian employees. I do so, for it appears that only Senate action will move the Department to treat its blue-collar employees in a fair manner.

The genesis of this resolution is a situation in the State of Rhode Island which, I fear, may also be prevalent in the other 49 States of the Union, whose citizens are employed by the Department of Defense and specifically by the Department of the Navy.

While other workers have certain basic collective bargaining rights, those who are employed by the Government have wages and hours set by laws and regulation. The individual's ability to affect his wages and working conditions is



sorely limited. What I am specifically concerned with today is demonstrated by the experience of the Rhode Island blue-collar worker, who I believe is not receiving equitable treatment from his employer, the Department of the Navy.

If, let us say, a man works as a machinist for the Navy, he is paid what is termed a comparable rate of pay; that is, one which he would receive if he did the same job for a private firm in the adjacent geographic area. This I believe is logical and fair to both the employer and employee. The question then arises, how is the comparable rate determined? Now we get to the nub of the problem.

The Department of the Navy conducts what are termed areas wage surveys. This means that nearby businesses doing the same type of work as the naval installation are canvassed to find out what the prevailing wage is. It is clear that the area to be surveyed is a determining factor, for it is within this area that the comparable wages are to be found. One would assume that in fairness to its employees the Navy would attempt to make the area to be surveyed one which is truly representative of the work force at its installations. How else could there be a true wage picture obtained? However, when investigation was made of the area to be surveyed, to determine wages for Rhode Island employees of the Department of the Navy, it was found that the area had been so gerrymandered that Navy employees will be paid the lowest wages possible.

I queried the Navy department on this matter and found that the basic survey area had been established 24 years ago, in 1943, but I was assured that it had been updated and improved in 1956. Investigation established that the new areas added in 1956 are low wage areas, not contiguous to the Rhode Island wage market. The Navy, however, somehow feels that this addition does more truly represent the Rhode Island work force. The fact that no other government body has agreed with its determination of the Rhode Island work force has no bearing on the Navy's determination. Such agencies as the Census Bureau, ARA, EOA, who truly know the Rhode Island picture, are given little credence by bureaucrats in the Pentagon.

What is clear, Mr. President, is the fact that the Navy has established as a labor-market survey area for Rhode Island a chimerical geographic limitation which purposely excludes the second largest employer of Rhode Island citizens, the General Dynamics Co., of Groton, Conn. I submit that a survey of Rhode Island wage earners cannot truly give a picture of the wage potential unless that employer to which 5,000 Rhode Islanders commute daily is included in the survey area.

I was given many, many reasons for the exclusion of the Groton, Conn., area from the Narragansett area wage survey, none of them, to my mind, particularly valid. To be sure, the only complaints about the area wage survey are from the employees of the Navy. But, what private employer would complain; for if the largest boss in Rhode Island, the Navy, holds down wages, why should a normal, profit-minded employer complain?

The Senate should be fully aware of this determination of the Department of the Navy. These arbitrary actions cause employees to be paid less than they should be receiving. Such actions depress the wages in my State. If the Navy were truly interested in the morale of its workers, it would try to get the most representative area to survey, not one representative of the lowest wages available.

Mr. President, the experience of the Rhode Island Defense Department employee should not be allowed to be repeated in other States. Adoption of my resolution would direct the Department of Defense to resurvey its area determinations and thereafter resurvey the areas. Only by doing so will our Federal blue-collar employees receive fair and equitable treatment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my resolution be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the Record.

The resolution (S. Res. 171) was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

#### S. RES. 171

Whereas the wages of civilian employees of the Department of Defense, including the military departments, who are engaged in recognized trades and crafts and related occupations, are required to be fixed at rates corresponding with those payable to non-governmental employees in similar occupations; and

Whereas the rates of wages payable to non-governmental employees are ascertained for that purpose through surveys conducted within geographical wage areas established throughout the United States; and

Whereas, unless properly established, such areas inaccurately reflect the prevailing wage rates paid to nongovernmental employees, thereby resulting in erroneous determinations of rates to be paid to such Department of Defense employees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of Defense is requested to undertake immediately a study of wage areas established for its employees, including employees of the military departments, whose wage rates are determined under section 5341 of title 5, United States Code, in order to determine if such areas accurately reflect the present demographic and industrial profile of the adjacent area and accurately reflect the prevailing wage rates of employees privately employed in the locality in which such employees of the Department of Defense are employed.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967—AMENDMENTS

##### AMENDMENTS NOS. 351 THROUGH 356

Mr. PROUTY submitted six amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

##### AMENDMENTS NOS. 357 THROUGH 360

Mr. COOPER submitted four amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 2388, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who is officially absent, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 1484) to establish a Small Business Crime Protection Insurance Corporation, and for other purposes, the name of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1796) to impose quotas on the importation of certain textile articles.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the two Senators from the State of Washington [Mr. JACKSON and Mr. MAGNUSON] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1856) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 2061) to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, the name of the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate Joint Resolution 101 to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to guarantee certain loans made to the National Maritime Historical Society for the purpose of restoring and returning to the United States the last surviving American square-rigged merchant ship, the *Kaiulani*, the names of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate Joint Resolution 111, introduced by me, expressing opposition to vesting title to the ocean floor in the United Nations at this time, the names of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, last May 10, I inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report dealing with problems of unemployment in a free society. One of the most pertinent findings contained in that report was that total

unemployment in this country would have increased during the period, June 1960 to February 1967, except for the large gain in employment by the Federal Government.

I now call attention to a recent article appearing in the September issue of *Monthly Labor Review*, written by Richard P. Oliver of the Division of Economic Growth, Bureau of Labor Statistics, entitled, "The Employment Effect of Defense Expenditures." On September 14, 1967, the *Wall Street Journal* quoted extracts from this article under the headline, "Vietnam Buildup Boosted U.S. Employment by One Million Jobs Since 1965, Agency Says."

In his article, among other things, Mr. Oliver estimates that of the 3 million jobs in the private sector, generated by military expenditures during fiscal year 1967, about 1 million may be attributed to Vietnam.

In my mind, Mr. President, these two articles emphasize the importance of planning now for the eventual termination of the Vietnam conflict in terms of a national transition from wartime to peacetime employment. We must not falsely assume that the present high degree of employment will or can continue in a peacetime economy. I hope that my colleagues in the Senate as well as the leaders of all segments of our society read these two articles and consider the lessons they have to offer.

They may provide the impetus for foresight and intelligent planning needed to alleviate the frustrations and insecurity which could result, not only from the search for civilian employment by returning veterans, but from civilian job layoffs of thousands of employed people following the Vietnam war. We must not allow ourselves to falsely anticipate a healthy peacetime employment by ignoring the impact of Federal Government job increases and also the employment effect of current wartime expenditures.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both articles be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### THE EMPLOYMENT EFFECT OF DEFENSE EXPENDITURES

(By Richard P. Oliver, Division of Economic Growth, Bureau of Labor Statistics)

In mid-1965 defense expenditures began to increase to meet our expanding commitments in Vietnam. In the next 2 years military expenditures rose from a monthly low of \$3.3 billion at the beginning of fiscal year 1965 to a high of \$6.7 billion in March 1967, as our troop strength in Vietnam rose from about 25,000 to about 500,000. Defense expenditures in fiscal 1965 amounted to \$47.4 billion, while in fiscal 1967 they were about \$68.4 billion, an increase of \$21.0 billion in current dollars. Expenditures of this magnitude, of course, have a major effect on employment and produce varying results in different industries.

This article presents estimates of the employment generated in each industry by Department of Defense (DOD) military expenditures in fiscal years 1965 and 1967, and that portion of employment in fiscal year 1967 that might be attributed to the Vietnam buildup. These estimates were derived by using an interindustry model and techniques developed as part of the Interagency Growth Project.<sup>1</sup> Detailed estimates of military purchases of final goods and services were processed through the model to obtain the total of direct and indirect output necessary to produce these purchases. Estimates of defense-generated employment were obtained by converting industry outputs to employment using productivity factors for 1965 and 1967.

#### EMPLOYMENT EFFECTS, 1965-67

The total employment generated by these expenditures, including military personnel

<sup>1</sup> See *Projections 1970; Interindustry Relationships, Potential Demand, Employment* (BLS Bulletin 1536, 1967. See also "Interindustry Employment Requirements," *Monthly Labor Review*, July 1965, pp. 841-850, for a description of methods of deriving employment estimates.

and DOD civilian employees, is estimated at about 5.7 million persons in fiscal year 1965 and 7.4 million in fiscal year 1967. Military personnel, the largest single component of this total, increased to 3.4 million from 2.7 during this period. Government and private defense-related civilian employment rose from about 3.0 to 4.1 million, an increase of 1,045,000. This increase amounted to about 23 percent of the total increase in civilian employment during the period. DOD civilian employment in the United States for military functions increased from slightly more than 900,000 to nearly 1.1 million. Estimated employment of wage and salary workers in the private sector attributable<sup>2</sup> to military expenditures rose from about 2.1 million in fiscal year 1965 to 3.0 million in fiscal year 1967. This increase raised the proportion of private employment generated by military expenditures from 3.9 percent of the total in fiscal year 1965 to 5.2 percent in fiscal year 1967.

Each billion dollars of defense purchases from the private sector was estimated to create 82,000 jobs in fiscal year 1965 and 73,000 jobs in fiscal year 1967 with the decline due to higher prices and productivity increases. Holding prices constant, the aggregate productivity per worker, associated with all DOD purchases of final goods and services from the private sector, increased from fiscal year 1965 to fiscal year 1967 by 5.8 percent—about average for the private nonfarm economy in this period.

The proportion of employment attributable to military expenditures varied considerably from industry to industry. However, the employment estimates shown in table 1 indicate that only three of the aggregate industry sectors were heavily dependent on military purchases in both 1965 and 1967.

<sup>2</sup> Employment attributable to military expenditures includes both the direct employment necessary to produce the final goods and services purchased and the indirect employment required in all levels of supporting industries which provide materials, components, transportation, and distribution services ultimately embodied in the final purchase. The indirect employment estimates do not include the income multiplier or accelerator effects which induce further consumption and investment purchases.

TABLE 1. ESTIMATED EMPLOYMENT ATTRIBUTABLE TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EXPENDITURES,<sup>1</sup> FISCAL YEARS 1965 AND 1967, AND THAT ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE VIETNAM BUILDUP IN 1967<sup>2</sup>

Industry No.	Industry	Fiscal year 1965				Fiscal year 1967				Employment attributable to buildup		
		Total employment	DOD-generated employment			Total employment	DOD-generated employment			Number	As percent of DOD-generated employment	As percent of total industry employment
			Number	As percent of total	Percent distribution		Number	As percent of total	Percent distribution			
	Federal Government.....	5,067	3,635.4	72.0	-----	6,016	4,438.5	73.8	-----	798.8	18.0	13.3
	Military.....	2,716	2,716.0	100.0	-----	3,350	3,350.0	100.0	-----	634.0	18.9	18.9
	Civilian.....	2,351	919.4	39.1	-----	2,666	1,087.5	40.8	-----	164.8	15.2	6.2
	State and local government.....	7,462	12.6	0.2	-----	8,569	19.3	0.2	-----	6.0	31.1	1.7
	Total, civilian public and private.....	64,296	3,033.2	4.7	-----	68,905	4,078.3	5.9	-----	1,179.6	28.9	1.7
	Total, public and private.....	67,012	5,749.2	8.6	-----	72,255	7,428.3	10.3	-----	1,813.6	24.4	2.5
	Total, private.....	54,483	2,101.2	3.9	100.0	57,670	2,971.5	5.2	100.0	1,008.8	33.9	1.7
	Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries.....	5,034	48.5	1.0	2.3	4,075	75.0	1.8	2.5	32.8	43.7	.8
1	Livestock and livestock products.....	4,848	45.9	.9	2.2	3,869	69.9	1.8	2.4	30.4	43.5	.8
2	Other agricultural products.....	62	1.1	1.8	.1	69	2.4	3.5	.1	1.3	54.2	1.9
3	Forestry and fishery products.....	124	1.5	1.2	.1	137	2.7	2.0	.1	1.1	40.7	.8
4	Agricultural, forestry, and fishery services.....	634	29.9	4.7	1.4	620	40.0	6.5	1.3	13.1	32.8	2.1
	Mining.....	28	1.6	5.7	.1	29	2.2	7.6	.1	.8	36.4	2.8
5	Iron and ferroalloy ores mining.....	53	3.8	7.2	.2	56	5.6	10.0	.2	2.0	35.7	3.6
6	Nonferrous metal ores mining.....	145	4.5	3.1	.2	140	6.2	4.4	.2	2.1	33.9	1.5
7	Coal mining.....	291	16.4	5.6	.8	276	20.9	7.6	.7	6.4	30.6	2.3
8	Crude petroleum and natural gas.....	117	3.6	3.1	.2	119	5.1	4.3	.2	1.8	35.3	1.5
9	Stone and clay mining and quarrying.....											
10	Chemical and fertilizer mineral mining.....											
	Construction:											
11	New construction.....	3,119	60.0	1.9	2.8	3,277	67.9	2.1	2.3	5.0	7.4	.2
12	Maintenance and repair construction.....	17,604	1,390.2	7.9	66.2	19,318	2,021.6	10.5	68.0	737.7	36.5	3.8
	Manufacturing.....											

See footnotes at end of table.



TABLE 1. ESTIMATED EMPLOYMENT ATTRIBUTABLE TO DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE EXPENDITURES,<sup>1</sup> FISCAL YEARS 1965 AND 1967, AND THAT ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE VIETNAM BUILDUP IN 1967<sup>2</sup>—Continued

Industry No.	Industry	Fiscal year 1965				Fiscal year 1967				Employment attributable to buildup			
		Total employment	DOD-generated employment			Total employment	DOD-generated employment			Number	As percent of DOD-generated employment	As percent of total industry employment	Percent distribution
			Number	As percent of total	Percent distribution		Number	As percent of total	Percent distribution				
Manufacturing—Continued													
13	Ordnance and accessories.....	227	106.1	46.7	5.0	284	183.9	64.8	6.2	92.9	50.5	36.6	9.2
14	Food and kindred products.....	1,752	20.3	1.2	1.0	1,767	31.7	1.8	1.1	12.6	39.7	.7	1.2
15	Tobacco manufactures.....	90	4.4	.4	.3	83	7.7	.8	.4	3.3	42.8	.4	.3
16	Broad and narrow fabrics, yarn and thread mills.....	574	14.8	2.6	.7	599	41.6	6.9	1.4	27.6	66.3	4.6	2.7
17	Miscellaneous textile goods and floor coverings.....	110	2.2	2.0	.1	117	4.3	3.7	.1	2.2	51.2	1.9	.2
18	Apparel.....	1,395	16.1	1.2	.8	1,457	46.5	3.2	1.6	30.8	66.2	2.1	3.1
19	Miscellaneous fabricated textile products.....	158	4.4	2.8	.2	168	10.2	6.1	.3	6.1	59.8	3.6	.4
20	Lumber and wood products, except containers.....	571	12.5	2.2	.6	572	26.3	4.6	.9	14.1	53.6	2.5	1.4
21	Wooden containers.....	34	1.3	3.8	.1	36	7.0	19.4	.2	5.8	82.9	16.1	.6
22	Household furniture.....	302	7.7	2.5	.4	330	9.5	2.9	.3	2.1	22.1	.6	.2
23	Other furniture and fixtures.....	117	2.5	2.1	.1	131	3.9	3.0	.1	1.5	38.5	1.1	.1
24	Paper and allied products, except containers.....	435	13.2	3.0	.6	468	19.3	4.1	.6	6.7	34.7	1.4	.7
25	Paperboard containers and boxes.....	196	6.6	3.4	.3	215	12.4	5.8	.4	6.1	49.2	2.8	.6
26	Printing and publishing.....	965	29.2	3.0	1.4	1,051	39.5	3.8	1.3	12.5	31.6	1.2	1.2
27	Chemicals and selected chemical products.....	420	19.3	4.6	.9	459	38.7	8.4	1.3	21.7	56.1	4.7	2.2
28	Plastics and synthetic materials.....	187	7.4	4.0	.4	210	12.9	6.1	.4	6.3	48.8	3.0	.6
29	Drugs, cleaning and toilet preparations.....	218	3.2	1.5	.2	241	10.2	4.2	.3	7.4	72.5	3.1	.7
30	Paints and allied products.....	65	3.1	4.8	.1	67	4.0	6.0	.1	1.2	30.0	1.8	.1
31	Petroleum refining and related industries.....	182	10.9	6.0	.5	182	14.5	8.0	.5	4.4	30.3	2.4	.4
32	Rubber and miscellaneous plastic products.....	454	19.0	4.2	.9	527	32.5	6.2	1.1	14.5	44.6	2.8	1.4
33	Leather tanning and industrial leather products.....	35	6.1	1.7	.2	34	1.4	4.1	.1	.8	57.1	2.4	.1
34	Footwear and other leather products.....	315	4.1	1.3	.2	318	11.3	3.6	.4	7.4	65.5	2.3	.7
35	Glass and glass products.....	166	6.9	4.2	.3	182	9.9	5.4	.3	3.4	34.3	1.9	.3
36	Stone and clay products.....	454	16.2	3.6	.8	454	21.9	4.8	.7	7.1	32.4	1.6	.7
37	Primary iron and steel manufacturing.....	934	55.2	5.9	2.6	943	82.8	8.8	2.8	30.3	36.6	3.2	3.0
38	Primary nonferrous metals manufacturing.....	343	34.3	10.0	1.6	382	52.0	13.6	1.7	19.2	36.9	5.0	1.9
39	Metal containers.....	72	1.4	1.9	.1	72	3.2	4.4	.1	1.8	56.2	2.5	.2
40	Heating, plumbing, and structural metal products.....	443	14.6	3.3	.7	481	18.6	3.9	.6	4.9	26.3	1.0	.5
41	Stampings, screw machine products and bolts.....	302	25.2	8.3	1.2	352	35.8	10.2	1.2	11.2	31.3	3.2	1.1
42	Other fabricated metal products.....	408	20.4	5.0	1.0	458	29.5	6.4	1.0	10.3	34.9	2.2	1.0
43	Engines and turbines.....	88	7.7	8.8	.4	98	11.3	11.5	.4	4.3	38.1	4.4	.4
44	Farm machinery and equipment.....	130	1.7	1.3	.1	150	3.3	2.2	.1	1.7	51.5	1.1	.2
45	Construction, mining and oil field machinery.....	172	3.5	2.0	.2	192	11.0	5.7	.4	7.5	68.2	3.9	.7
46	Materials handling machinery and equipment.....	75	3.3	4.4	.2	86	6.6	7.7	.2	3.5	53.0	4.1	.3
47	Metalworking machinery and equipment.....	293	24.0	8.2	1.1	342	38.3	11.2	1.3	16.5	43.1	4.8	1.6
48	Special industry machinery and equipment.....	186	3.3	1.8	.2	204	4.9	2.4	.2	2.0	40.8	1.0	.2
49	General industrial machinery and equipment.....	251	13.8	5.5	.7	282	21.7	7.7	.7	9.2	42.1	3.3	.9
50	Machine shop products.....	180	28.4	15.8	1.3	221	51.4	23.3	1.7	23.3	45.3	10.5	2.3
51	Office, computing, and accounting machines.....	179	15.4	8.6	.7	227	21.9	9.6	.7	8.0	36.5	3.5	.8
52	Service industry machines.....	111	3.1	2.8	.1	118	4.5	3.8	.2	1.9	42.2	1.6	.2
53	Electric industrial equipment and apparatus.....	349	33.0	9.5	1.6	418	47.1	11.3	1.6	18.1	38.4	4.3	1.8
54	Household appliances.....	164	2.3	1.4	.1	182	3.4	1.9	.1	1.1	32.4	.6	.1
55	Electric lighting and wiring equipment.....	165	9.8	5.9	.5	192	15.3	8.0	.5	6.1	39.9	3.2	.6
56	Radio, television, and communication equipment.....	533	182.0	34.1	8.7	666	221.7	33.3	7.5	49.3	22.2	7.4	4.9
57	Electronic components and accessories.....	280	71.5	25.5	3.4	379	99.0	26.1	3.3	31.1	31.4	8.2	3.1
58	Miscellaneous electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies.....	95	6.6	6.9	.3	109	9.0	8.3	.3	3.3	36.7	3.0	.3
59	Motor vehicles and equipment.....	787	14.4	1.8	0.7	841	29.4	3.5	1.0	14.4	49.0	1.7	1.4
60	Aircraft and parts.....	602	365.9	60.8	17.4	803	474.2	59.1	16.0	141.6	29.9	17.6	14.0
61	Other transportation equipment.....	260	69.8	26.8	3.3	285	64.2	22.5	2.2	2.2	26.9	2.8	.4
62	Scientific and controlling instruments.....	252	31.6	12.5	1.5	292	41.6	14.2	1.4	13.8	33.2	4.7	1.4
63	Optical, ophthalmic, and photographic equipment.....	124	12.7	10.2	.6	152	15.6	10.3	.5	4.2	26.9	2.8	.4
64	Miscellaneous manufacturing.....	404	7.3	1.8	.3	439	10.2	2.3	.3	3.6	35.3	.8	.4
Services.....		28,092	572.6	2.0	27.3	30,380	767.0	2.5	25.8	220.2	28.7	.7	21.8
65	Transportation and warehousing.....	2,504	144.3	5.8	6.9	259.3	204.9	7.9	6.9	74.9	36.6	2.9	7.4
66	Communications, excluding radio and TV broadcasting.....	759	24.6	3.2	1.2	834	31.7	3.8	1.1	10.2	32.1	1.2	1.0
67	Radio and TV broadcasting.....	105	3.9	3.7	.2	114	5.9	5.2	.2	1.8	30.5	1.6	.2
68	Electric, gas, water, and sanitary services.....	619	19.5	3.2	.9	639	24.2	3.8	.8	6.7	27.7	1.0	.7
69	Wholesale and retail trade.....	12,414	121.0	1.0	5.8	13,423	166.3	1.2	5.6	50.2	30.2	.4	5.0
70	Finance and insurance.....	2,424	32.4	1.3	1.5	2,570	52.2	2.0	1.8	20.1	38.5	.8	2.0
71	Real estate and rental.....	563	5.8	1.0	.3	567	7.6	1.3	.3	2.3	30.3	.4	.2
72	Hotels; personal and repair services, excluding auto.....	1,787	25.4	1.4	1.2	1,980	37.1	1.9	1.2	12.4	33.4	.6	1.2
73	Business services.....	1,778	92.1	5.2	4.4	1,970	126.5	6.4	4.3	35.7	28.2	1.8	3.5
74	Research and development.....	329	4.0	1.2	.2	365	5.9	1.6	.2	2.0	33.9	.5	.2
75	Automobile repair and service.....	578	7.1	1.2	.3	640	9.0	1.4	.3	2.2	24.4	.3	.2
76	Amusements.....	4,232	92.5	2.2	4.4	4,685	95.6	2.0	3.2	1.7	1.8	.2	.2
77	Medical, educational services and nonprofit organizations.....												

<sup>1</sup> Employment estimates cover wage and salary employees in the United States attributable to Department of Defense military functions. They do not include the self-employed, domestic workers, or U.S. citizens employed abroad other than military personnel. However, farm employment does include self-employed and unpaid family workers.

<sup>2</sup> Total employment estimates for fiscal year 1967 are based on first 9 months results.

<sup>3</sup> Includes Government enterprises.

<sup>4</sup> Includes domestic civilian employment of the Department of Defense (military functions) and some small employment effect on Government enterprises.

<sup>5</sup> The impact of Department of Defense expenditures on the aircraft industry reflects a cutback in missile engine work in 1967, resulting in an understatement of the Vietnam employment increase.

<sup>6</sup> Expenditures in constant dollars declined slightly between 1965 and 1967.

DOD purchases of completed missiles, produced in the ordnance industry, declined somewhat from 1965 to 1967 reducing the effect of the increase in conventional ordnance on total sector employment. A decline during fiscal year 1967 of purchases of completed space vehicles by the National Space and Aeronautics Administration contributed to the increase in the proportion of industry employment generated by DOD spending. In the communications equipment industry, though the number of jobs rose during the period, there was a slight decline in the ratio of employment attributable to defense

spending due to the sharp increase in civilian demand for radio and television.

Regarding other industries, new construction and shipbuilding were the only ones to show a decline in estimated employment generated by defense expenditures. While military construction expenditures increased from 1965 to 1967, this increase was due to construction abroad, principally in Vietnam, and not domestic military construction which declined slightly. However, total domestic construction employment generated by the Department of Defense increased somewhat due to a rise in maintenance construction.

Defense-generated employment in the "other transportation equipment" sector, which includes shipbuilding, declined from about 70,000 jobs or 27 percent in 1965 to about 54,000 in 1967, as expenditures were shifted from shipbuilding to higher priority Vietnam functions. Most of the defense purchases from this sector were for shipbuilding with much smaller expenditures on railroad equipment, motorcycles, and other transportation items. A direct comparison of defense-generated employment from shipbuilding expenditures with employment in the ship-

building industry would show a much higher, although still declining, relationship.<sup>2</sup>

The total employment generated by defense purchases in the private sector was fairly broadly distributed by industry in both fiscal years. The few industries with 5 percent or more of defense-generated employment accounted for only about 40 percent of the total in both years.

*Percent of total defense-generated private employment*

Industries with 5 percent or more of defense-generated private employment:

	1965	1967
Aircraft .....	17	16
Ordnance .....	5	6
Communications equipment.....	9	8
Transportation .....	7	7
Wholesale and retail trade.....	6	6

**EFFECTS OF VIETNAM BUILDUP**

The amount of defense-generated employment in the private sector in fiscal year 1967 which was estimated to be due to Vietnam military expenditures is shown in table 1. These estimates indicate that of the 3 million jobs generated by military expenditures, about 1 million may be attributed to Vietnam. This should not be interpreted to mean that 1 million jobs would be lost if the conflict in Vietnam were to end. Declines in this employment would be affected by a number of elements including the nature and timing of the reduction in military expenditures and the size of the Armed Forces, the fiscal and manpower policies developed to cushion the transition, the shifting of personnel in defense work to civilian production, and reduction in overtime hours of work.

The estimates of the private employment generated by the buildup were derived by assuming that the increase in military expenditures in constant prices from fiscal year 1965 to fiscal year 1967 represented an approximate measure of the size and composition of expenditures related to Vietnam. This is approximate because some of the 1965 base expenditures have probably been shifted from lower priority items to meet more urgent Vietnam needs, and some of the increase in 1967 may have been for items not directly related to Vietnam. The increment in purchases was assumed to be the amount of expenditures in each industry in fiscal year 1967 which were due to Vietnam. Employment requirements were then generated separately for these incremental purchases using current input-output and productivity factors.

It should be noted that the employment due to the Vietnam buildup was not estimated by simply taking the difference between defense-generated employment in fiscal years 1965 and 1967. That increase in employment would reflect two components which are partially offsetting: the increase in employment due to the defense buildup and the reduction in employment due to the in-

creased productivity in defense industries and their suppliers. The net effect of these two factors would show an increase of less than 900,000 in defense-generated private employment, rather than about 1 million.

In a number of industries, the increase in defense-related employment due to the buildup was more substantial, but this increment remained a small proportion of total employment in the industry. About 66 percent of the total defense-generated employment in the apparel industry in fiscal year 1967 was attributable to the buildup, but this buildup employment was only 2 percent of total employment in the industry. Similarly, over 70 percent of the defense-generated employment in the drug industry in fiscal year 1967 was estimated to be due to the buildup, but this was only 3 percent of total industry employment.

The industry distribution of the Vietnam-generated employment generally followed the total defense employment patterns of fiscal years 1965 and 1967. The employment effects of Vietnam were spread over a wide range of industries with few industries accounting for more than 5 percent of the total.

*Percent of Vietnam-generated private employment*

Industries with 5 percent or more of Vietnam-generated employment:

Aircraft .....	14
Ordnance .....	9
Communications equipment .....	5
Transportation .....	7
Wholesale and retail trade.....	5

**NOTE ON PROCEDURE**

The estimates of employment attributable to military expenditures were derived in three stages: (a) DOD military expenditures were examined in considerable detail to identify goods and services actually purchased, (b) these purchases were processed through an interindustry model to determine total generated production in each industry, and (c) the industry production levels were converted to employment estimates.

Basically, an interindustry model provides a means of calculating the production requirements levied on all supplying industries throughout the economy by a purchase of final products. Purchase of aircraft, for example, implies a demand for engines, airframes, electronics, and other components. The production of each of these components generates requirements for their inputs, each of which, in turn, generates further chains of input requirements back through the more basic stages of production, distribution, and transportation.

The basis and classification of the interindustry model used were consistent with the Office of Business Economics 1958 interindustry study. However, coefficients were revised by the Interagency Growth Project to account for changes from 1958. Estimated DOD expenditures for the most part corresponded to national income definitions and procedures, except that food and clothing provided in kind were not treated as compensation, but rather as purchases from the food and clothing industries. In addition, the estimates differ from national income treatment of military expenditures in that they account for expenditures or payments when made, rather than when the end items are delivered. Also, construction differs from the input-output convention by being limited to contract construction, excluding force account or DOD construction labor which here appears in Government employment. The output of Government-owned and operated shipyards and arsenals were not considered as purchases from the shipbuilding and ordnance industries, but were treated as Government purchases of materials and services consumed and as Government employee compensation.

**DERIVATION OF DOD EXPENDITURES**

Defense expenditures were considered as covering only the military expenditures of the

Department of the Defense and the Military Assistance Program, excluding DOD civilian functions and Atomic Energy Commission purchases. Expenditures were developed separately for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Defense Agencies and the Civil Defense and Military Assistance Program. Expenditures of each of the military departments and defense agencies were distributed by the functional titles or budget sectors of Military Personnel, Operations and Maintenance, Procurement, Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, and Construction, Civil Defense, Family Housing, Military Assistance, and Revolving and Management Fund purchases were treated separately. DOD expenditures estimates were available for these sectors by military department for both years. DOD accounts for each budget sector were then analyzed to distribute each of these totals with the greatest possible degree of detail. While considerable expenditure detail was available for fiscal year 1965, for fiscal year 1967, obligations, with some timing adjustments, were used to estimate more detailed expenditures for each sector. Expenditures were then coded at a 4-digit Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) level, based on product identification and combined by the same SIC for each budget sector.

Various adjustments were required to bring DOD stated expenditures closer to actual purchases. These included adjustment of some procurement expenditures for Government-furnished equipment (GFE) or component items purchased directly by DOD and provided to a contractor for assembly. In the case of aircraft, missiles, ships, and vehicles, DOD generally contracts directly for major components and has them assembled by a prime contractor who otherwise would have purchased them under subcontracts. Since DOD accounts show only expenditures for the completed weapon, it was necessary to subtract the amount of components purchased under GFE and assign them to the actual component SIC. Also, purchases from Industrial Fund activities, such as shipyards, arsenals, transportation, and overhaul functions, had to be subtracted from the product or service provided and distributed to the actual purchases of labor and materials.

The revised list of expenditures was then converted to a national income basis by eliminating certain expenditures which do not represent current production, such as retired pay and purchases of land and other existing assets. However, not all national income adjustments were made. Timing adjustments required to put expenditures on a delivery basis, principally affecting long leadtime items such as shipbuilding, were ignored since current payments provide a better basis for estimating employment. Similarly, receipts were not subtracted from expenditures since this would have had the effect of reducing the actual amount of employment required. DOD expenditure estimates for 1965 were checked, where possible, against the Bureau of the Census Survey, MA-175, "Shipments of Defense-Oriented Industries, 1965," which provides information on sales to the Department of Defense by 4-digit SIC. Individual industry price deflators were then applied to convert expenditures to 1958 dollars, the basis required by the interindustry model.

Table 2 presents the estimated military purchases of final goods and services for fiscal years 1965 and 1967. These estimated expenditures are in 1958 dollars and have been converted from purchasers' to producers' prices.<sup>4</sup> National income and input-output conventions have been followed, with

<sup>4</sup> Producers' prices exclude the distribution costs of transportation and trade. The sum of trade and transportation costs associated with each purchase appear as aggregate purchases from the trade and transportation sectors.

<sup>2</sup> In interpreting table 1, it should be noted that the estimates of defense-generated employment as a percent of industry employment are affected in varying degrees by the particular classification system used. The interindustry sectors are usually an aggregate representing several related industries, while DOD purchases may have been predominantly from just one, resulting in misleading comparisons. For example, shipbuilding is part of a sector called "other transportation equipment," (railroad equipment, motor cycles, etc.), with the result that the high proportion of shipbuilding employment attributable to defense expenditures is included with other activities which have only negligible sales to DOD. This particular sector is probably affected more than any other by the consolidation of industries with wide variation in defense sales.



the exceptions noted earlier. However, this list differs from the 1958 input-output approach in the way research expenditures were treated. Research and development (R&D) performed in manufacturing establishments was left in the originating sector's sales to the DOD. In the 1958 study, this type of R&D was considered an intermediate or secondary product of the producing industry and was transferred to the R&D sector. Residual R&D, therefore, represents purchases from commercial R&D establishments.

These expenditures were processed through the interindustry model to generate total direct and indirect production requirements. Production levels attributable to defense were checked against total production in each industry for reasonableness. Production levels were then transformed into industry employment requirements. Productivity factors used to convert output to employment reflect the unit employment requirements for each industry in fiscal year 1965 and fiscal year 1967. Employment estimates were de-

rived for wage and salary employees, excluding the self-employed, except for farm workers. However, the number of self-employed persons in industries selling to DOD is believed to be insignificant. The employment estimates obtained were checked for reasonableness against industry employment figures obtained in a DOD survey of major defense contractors. Employment estimates provided in this article do not include the income multiplier or accelerator effects which induce further consumption and investment purchases, nor employment outside of the United States generated by offshore procurement or direct hire of civilians.

"Effect of Defense Program on Private Manufacturing Employment," *Monthly Labor Review*, January 1942:

"Defense expenditures have stimulated all lines of trade and industry, but the chief burden of producing war materiel has fallen on manufacturers normally engaged in the production of heavy durable goods. This is indicated by the fact that, although total

factory employment increased by 2,500,000 wage earners from June 1940 to October 1941, 1,700,000 of these wage earners entered the durable-goods industries as compared to 800,000 entering the nondurable-goods industries. In October 1941, durable-goods employment reached a total of 5,500,000 wage earners, while employment in nondurable-goods manufacturing amounted to 5,100,000. This is a reversal of the relative positions of the two branches of industry, for even at the peak of the 1929 boom, when the per capita consumption of durable consumer goods was at a high level, nondurable-goods employment was greater than that in the durable-goods industries. As the defense program develops, a further expansion in durable-goods employment is to be expected. Furthermore, within the framework of the durable-goods industries the rate of conversion from production of consumer goods to that of war materiel will be accelerated. The problem of raw-material supply itself will make this conversion imperative."

TABLE 2.—ESTIMATED DEFENSE EXPENDITURES, FISCAL YEARS 1965 AND 1967

(Millions of 1958 dollars, producers' prices)<sup>1</sup>

Industry No.	Industry	1965		1967		Percent change, 1965-67	Industry No.	Industry	1965		1967		Percent change, 1965-67
		Defense purchases	Percent distribution	Defense purchases	Percent distribution				Defense purchases	Percent distribution	Defense purchases	Percent distribution	
	Total.....	\$40,017.5	100.0	\$54,372.9	100.0	35.9							
	Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries..	2.6	-----	3.1	-----	19.2	39	Manufacturing—Continued					
1	Livestock and livestock products.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	40	Metal containers.....	\$6.6	-----	\$42.6	.1	545.5
2	Other agricultural products.....	1.2	-----	1.2	-----	50.0	41	Heating, plumbing, and structural metal products.....	160.5	.4	259.7	.5	61.8
3	Forestry and fishery products.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	42	Stampings, screw machine products, and bolts.....	17.6	-----	39.9	.1	126.7
4	Agricultural, forestry, and fishery services.....	1.2	-----	1.6	-----	33.3	43	Other fabricated metal products.....	30.6	.1	54.2	.1	77.1
	Mining.....	16.6	-----	21.6	-----	30.1	44	Engines and turbines.....	148.8	.4	249.7	.5	67.8
5	Iron and ferroalloy ores mining.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	45	Farm machinery and equipment.....	15.7	-----	43.2	.1	175.2
6	Nonferrous metal ores mining.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	46	Construction, mining, and oil field machinery.....	57.1	0.1	215.3	0.4	277.1
7	Coal mining.....	.3	-----	.3	-----	-----	47	Materials handling machinery and equipment.....	48.6	.1	116.0	.2	138.7
8	Crude petroleum and natural gas.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	48	Metalworking machinery and equipment.....	87.5	.2	226.7	.4	159.1
9	Stone and clay mining and quarrying.....	16.2	-----	21.3	-----	31.5	49	Special industry machinery and equipment.....	26.1	.1	39.0	.1	49.4
10	Chemical and fertilizer mineral mining.....	.1	-----	-----	-----	-100.0	50	General industrial machinery and equipment.....	80.8	-----	160.4	.3	98.5
	Construction.....	248.2	.6	275.2	.5	10.9	51	Machine shop products.....	35.7	.1	50.6	.1	41.7
11	New construction.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	52	Office, computing, and accounting machines.....	310.7	.8	457.5	.8	47.2
12	Maintenance and repair construction.....	248.2	.6	275.2	.5	10.9	53	Service industry machinery and apparatus.....	57.7	.1	97.5	.2	69.0
	Manufacturing.....	18,840.7	47.1	29,265.6	53.8	55.3	54	Electric industrial equipment and apparatus.....	314.7	.8	562.7	1.0	78.8
13	Ordnance and accessories.....	2,052.7	5.1	4,200.4	7.7	104.6	55	Household appliances.....	14.1	-----	26.4	-----	87.2
14	Food and kindred products.....	520.6	1.3	877.2	1.6	68.5	56	Electric lighting and wiring equipment.....	37.5	.1	84.9	.2	126.4
15	Tobacco manufactures.....	18.0	-----	35.0	.1	94.4	57	Radio, television, and communication equipment.....	3,449.3	8.6	4,257.8	7.8	23.4
16	Broad and narrow fabrics, yarn and thread mills.....	94.3	.2	370.5	.7	292.9	58	Electronic components and accessories.....	218.6	.5	236.6	.4	8.2
17	Miscellaneous textile goods and floor coverings.....	3.7	-----	18.6	-----	402.7	59	Miscellaneous electrical machinery equipment and supplies.....	69.3	.2	112.8	.2	62.8
18	Apparel.....	149.9	.4	488.7	.9	226.0	60	Motor vehicles and equipment.....	401.0	1.0	867.9	1.6	116.4
19	Miscellaneous fabricated textile products.....	61.2	.2	165.3	.3	170.1	61	Aircraft and parts.....	6,945.5	17.4	9,655.7	17.8	39.0
20	Lumber and wood products except containers.....	26.2	.1	113.9	.2	334.7	62	Other transportation equipment.....	969.8	2.4	906.0	1.7	-6.6
21	Wooden containers.....	8.7	-----	107.1	.2	1,131.0	63	Scientific and controlling instruments.....	354.2	.9	523.5	1.0	47.8
22	Household furniture.....	7.2	-----	10.2	-----	41.7	64	Optical, ophthalmic, and photographic equipment.....	230.1	.6	296.0	.5	28.6
23	Other furniture and fixtures.....	28.2	.1	52.6	.1	186.5		Miscellaneous manufacturing.....	16.8	-----	23.0	-----	36.9
24	Paper and allied products, except containers.....	19.3	-----	22.9	-----	18.7		Services.....	4,287.4	10.7	5,643.0	10.4	31.6
25	Paperboard containers and boxes.....	3.1	-----	20.1	-----	548.3	65	Transportation and warehousing.....	1,499.2	3.7	2,371.2	4.4	58.2
26	Printing and publishing.....	73.7	.2	105.8	.2	43.6	66	Communications, except radio and TV broadcasting.....	216.6	.5	306.2	.6	41.4
27	Chemicals and selected chemical products.....	203.9	.5	670.2	1.2	228.7	67	Radio and TV broadcasting.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
28	Plastics and synthetic materials.....	13.7	-----	16.0	-----	16.8	68	Electric, gas, water, and sanitary services.....	313.3	.8	362.0	.7	15.5
29	Drugs, cleaning, and toilet preparations.....	61.0	.2	368.2	.7	503.6	69	Wholesale and retail trade.....	676.5	1.7	812.2	1.5	20.1
30	Paints and allied products.....	28.9	.1	30.9	.1	6.9	70	Finance and insurance.....	7.8	-----	38.9	.1	398.7
31	Petroleum refining and related industries.....	954.7	2.4	1,306.4	2.4	36.8	71	Real estate and rental.....	118.6	.3	126.7	.2	6.8
32	Rubber and miscellaneous plastic products.....	82.4	.2	186.5	.3	126.3	72	Hotels; personal and repair services, except auto.....	103.2	.3	153.1	.3	48.4
33	Leather tanning and industrial leather products.....	.4	-----	1.6	-----	300.0	73	Business services.....	427.1	1.1	533.8	1.0	25.0
34	Footwear and other leather products.....	34.5	.1	105.0	.2	204.3	74	Research and development.....	322.4	.8	350.0	.6	8.6
35	Glass and glass products.....	5.9	-----	12.5	-----	111.9	75	Automobile repair and service.....	11.7	-----	13.7	-----	17.1
36	Stone and clay products.....	111.2	.3	150.8	.3	35.6	76	Amusements.....	30.0	.1	35.0	.1	16.7
37	Primary iron and steel manufacturing.....	84.7	.2	99.0	.2	16.9	77	Medical, educational, services and nonprofit organization.....	561.0	1.4	540.2	1.0	-3.7
38	Primary nonferrous metals manufacturing.....	87.7	.2	124.6	.2	42.1							

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 2.—ESTIMATED DEFENSE EXPENDITURES, FISCAL YEARS 1965 AND 1967—Continued

[Millions of 1958 dollars, producers' prices]<sup>1</sup>

Industry No.	Industry	1965		1967		Percent change, 1965-67	Industry No.	Industry	1965		1967		Percent change, 1965-67
		Defense purchases	Percent distribution	Defense purchases	Percent distribution				Defense purchases	Percent distribution	Defense purchases	Percent distribution	
	Government enterprises.....	\$0.2	-----	\$0.2	-----	-----		Dummy industries.....	\$20.9	0.1	\$24.2	0.1	15.8
78	Federal Government enterprises.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	81	Business travel, entertainment, and gifts.....	4.0	-----	3.0	-----	-25.0
79	State and local government enterprises.....	.2	-----	.2	-----	-----	82	Office supplies.....	16.9	-----	21.2	.1	25.4
	Imports:	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	83	Scrap, used and secondhand goods.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
80	Imports.....	1,494.0	3.7	2,019.2	3.7	35.2	84	Special industries: Government industry.....	15,106.9	37.8	17,120.8	31.5	13.3
80A	Directly allocated imports.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----			-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
80B	Transferred imports.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----			-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

<sup>1</sup> Figures are on a national income basis with the exceptions of subsistence and clothing provided in kind and timing and receipts adjustments, as noted in text.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 14, 1967]

#### VIETNAM BUILDUP BOOSTED U.S. EMPLOYMENT BY 1 MILLION JOBS SINCE 1965, AGENCY SAYS

WASHINGTON.—The escalation of the Vietnam war created more than one million U.S. jobs in the past two years, the Labor Department said in the first such comprehensive report since the war began.

The sharp rise in employment stemming from the military buildup amounted to some 23% of the total U.S. increase of more than four million jobs since 1965, the report said.

A further expansion of war work could create skilled-worker shortages of "considerable magnitude," said a companion report. Defense work currently accounts for 5.2% of the nation's total civilian employment, up from 3.9% two years ago. But "this shouldn't be interpreted to mean that one million jobs would be lost if the conflict in Vietnam were to end," said Richard P. Oliver of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

A switch of workers to production of civilian goods, the timing of cuts in military expenditures and Federal manpower policies would cushion a drop in war work if the conflict ended, Mr. Oliver said in the report published in the Monthly Labor Review.

The report said civilian jobs in defense work rose from about 3 million to 4.1 million in the past two years, with sharpest increases in the weapons, aircraft and communications equipment industries. During the same period, Mr. Oliver said, the number of military personnel rose from 2.7 million to 3.4 million. Thus, the total of civilians and military personnel whose jobs stem from the Vietnam war and other defense commitments totals about 7.5 million Americans—nearly 10% of the total labor force.

In a companion report, the bureau's mobilization expert, Max A. Rutzick, said about 18% of the nation's engineers are in defense work and some 22% of electrical and electronic technicians. War work also takes up 14% of all draftsmen, he said.

Mr. Oliver said the two-year Vietnam buildup didn't create any general labor shortages, "although temporary problems did exist in some cases." Mr. Rutzick said defense workers are more skilled than U.S. workers as a whole and "a continued climb in demand could create shortages of considerable magnitude among those workers who require both special aptitudes and lengthy training."

Total employment in the manufacture of weapons and ammunition for the war increased nearly 100,000, or 50%, in the past two years, Mr. Oliver's report said. He also attributed a rise of more than 141,000 jobs in the manufacture of aircraft and parts to the Vietnam buildup, and another 10,000 jobs in the manufacture of communications equipment for the war. The Vietnam buildup since 1965 also created some 74,000 jobs in transportation and warehousing, 30,000 in the clothing industry, 30,000 in iron and steel manufac-

turing and 12,000 in the food industry, Mr. Oliver said.

Noting that defense spending rose from some \$48 billion in 1965 to about \$70 billion this year, Mr. Oliver said "expenditures of this magnitude, of course, have a major effect on employment."

The report said war work increased jobs in almost all U.S. industries. "New construction and shipbuilding were the only ones to show a decline in estimated employment generated by defense expenditures," Mr. Oliver said.

In some areas, he said, the rise in production and jobs may be greater than shown by the study because the Defense Department does some of its own work. "The actual increase in conventional ordnance (weapons and ammunition) was somewhat greater" than shown in the Labor Department study of civilian production, he said. "Part of this increased output was provided by Government-owned and operated arsenals which aren't included in this (civilian) sector," he said.

The report said every \$1 billion in defense purchases in the private economy creates more than 70,000 jobs.

The companion study by Mr. Rutzick showed that more than one-fourth of the nation's aeronautical engineers, aircraft mechanics and physicists were involved in war work.

Mr. Oliver's study said the Vietnam buildup created more than 16,000 jobs in metal working machinery and equipment industries, 23,000 in machine shops, 18,000 in electric industrial equipment and 31,000 in the manufacture of electronic components and accessories. War needs also created 14,000 in the manufacture of motor vehicles and equipment, 13,000 in scientific and related instruments and more than 35,000 in research and development, Mr. Oliver said.

#### LOW DISCOUNT RATE CAUSES BILLIONS IN GOVERNMENT WASTE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, much interest focuses on economy in Government, because prospects of huge Federal deficits are at hand. But economy in Government becomes a vast sham if we are to accept certain administration policies. For, on one hand, while we hear echoing predictions of doom if a tax increase is not passed, on the other hand, the administration continues wasting valuable resources in utilizing grossly unrealistic means in planning many costly projects.

Last week the inquiry of the Economy in Government Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee into planning-programming-budgeting—PPB—heard testimony from experts who agreed that the present practice of using a discount rate based on the average interest rate payable by the Treasury on

interest-bearing marketable securities to compute project cost was economically absurd.

I might add that these expert economists agreed. There is not a single competent economist who does not agree with this position.

Instead of using this rate, which was 3½ percent for several years and now is approaching 5 percent, the Government should use the average rate of return obtained by industry—a rate at a minimum of at least 10 percent and probably nearer to 15 percent.

At 10 percent, projects involving billions of dollars in public works would show costs exceeding benefits. We would not fund them. By not funding these vast programs we would save billions of dollars and at the same time increase economic growth, because investment would be made in the private economy where returns are much higher.

A rationale for hiding behind a low rate is simple to explain. If planners use the low discount rate figure, project evaluations utilizing that rate in benefit-cost calculations do not need very high rates of return in order to make the project show benefits exceeding costs. The higher the discount rate in the analysis, the higher are the opportunity costs foregone—the alternative uses for the same resources—and the greater will be the benefits needed from the project.

In simple terms, as long as the administration sticks to the lower discount, taxpayers' funds are being mismanaged. As Government expenditures have been rising steadily, the more important is the need for proper spending guidelines. The PPB budgeting method explores alternative uses of funds in order to maximize the present values of total benefits less total costs—in other words, to get the highest return.

But, Mr. President, we cannot achieve such economic allocations if the administration insists on unrealistically low discount rates. The answer is not passage of a tax increase; the problem is not in the private sector. Instead, the administration must undertake to plan its expenditures on a more realistic basis. Using the proper discount rate is an imperative.

Mr. President, the proper rate leads to true investment decisions. At the same time, many currently planned and outright wasteful projects could be cut back. It just is not possible to stem inflationary pressures without such reductions.



The Congress must face up to its responsibilities and take a hard look at the cost estimates of programs. As John Haldi, former chief of the program evaluation staff at the Bureau of the Budget, told the committee—

Because bureaus are so frequently dominated by a single profession, there is a tendency for what might be called *professional biases* to be reflected in the criteria which a bureau generates to help govern its various expenditures . . . As one might expect, the economic impact of this frequently is to spend money on projects which are not necessary and which yield predictably few benefits.

And he also pointed out that the same bias may be behind congressional resistance to realistic cost estimates.

Sometimes they [criticisms] simply reflect chagrin that particular pet projects do not show up well under the light of cost-effectiveness analysis, then you are left with "effectiveness at any price whatsoever." And this is scarcely an acceptable approach to decision-making.

The use of an unrealistic discount rate in calculating the costs of public works and water resource projects has led to gross overinvestment in these areas. And because so many of these projects are politically dear to Congressmen and Senators, it is terribly difficult to get the Congress to insist on a more realistic costing of the projects. With the current heavy budgetary pressures, it is high time that we faced up to this necessity.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS ARE NOT A PANACEA—BUT A REAL STEP FORWARD TO UNIVERSAL HUMAN RIGHTS—CXLV

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery are not, in and of themselves, a panacea for all the ills besetting our world.

But I believe that the human rights conventions constitute a meaningful step toward the establishment of universal human rights.

The human rights conventions indicate an awareness by many people that human rights for all is not only desirable, but—even more pragmatically—are a major prerequisite for true peace.

Twice since 1914, this Nation has been forced into world wars. Twice we watched helplessly while unchecked domestic oppression grew into unprovoked foreign aggression.

Since the end of World War II, international aggression has been the almost exclusive practice of those regimes which first deprived their own citizens of the basic human freedoms.

I believe that the lesson is inescapable. Human rights and peace are intimately related and historically interdependent. Where human rights are secure, peace is attendant. Where the human rights of any people are threatened, peace itself is threatened.

Peace and freedom continue as the fundamental objectives of this Nation's foreign policy. These human rights conventions are a realistic attempt to establish universal standards of human dignity. The establishment of universal

standards of human rights is a direct route to world peace.

Everyone, I am sure, desires the granting of human rights to himself and his fellow man.

The question comes in translating this altruistic wish into concrete reality.

For those who espouse human rights, but oppose these conventions, I would recall the words of the late John Foster Dulles before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in 1950—

There are many people who do not want to have international conventions which will effectively regulate human conduct in relation to human rights . . . but to abandon this goal would involve substituting pious words for an effective result.

I could not agree more with these words of Secretary Dulles. Let the Senate translate our lofty rhetoric about the dignity of man into legal reality by ratifying the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Freedom of Association, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

#### WE MUST WIN THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY

(At this point, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, our late great President John F. Kennedy once said:

Those who make peaceful evolution impossible make violent revolution inevitable.

It is the responsibility of Congress to make peaceful evolution not only possible but an actual fact and to do this within the framework of law and order. It is legislative weakness to fail to provide adequate programs to attack the cause of poverty, slum housing—the crowding of people into filthy, broken-down tenements and then denying to youngsters born in such surroundings any opportunity or possibility for a decent education and for gainful employment.

Only Federal action on a large scale can strike to the heart of the grave problems facing our urban areas. Heavy additional investments must be made and on an enormous scale in order to overcome the handicaps caused by the deprivations suffered by millions of Americans and to give them opportunities equal to what others have.

Mr. President, our involvement in an ugly civil war in Vietnam, a little country of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States, 10,000 miles from our shores, goes on month after month. Billions of dollars of taxpayers' money has gone up and is going up in smoke. The time is long past due when we must spend huge sums of money to take care of our own.

There are those who say that we cannot afford both guns and butter. I assert that the problems today facing us here at home are of such magnitude that the terms "guns and butter" is no longer even applicable. What we are talking about in the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 and the Emergency Employment Act are efforts to solve the serious problem of want amidst plenty which strikes at the very heart of our

society. The question no longer is can we afford to solve these problems but rather how soon can we solve them. It is no longer a matter of guns and butter but rather of guns and water, for what the proposed legislation would accomplish is necessary for the very substance of our society.

These programs are not frills and giveaways. They are a serious first step toward bringing millions of ill-housed, ill-fed, poorly clothed, and undereducated Americans into the mainstream of American life.

Mr. President, even the proposals in the pending legislation are only a beginning. Once we extricate ourselves from the miserable civil war in Vietnam, which is draining our national resources, we can get on with the important work of really trying to solve our domestic problems.

The housing program that we have at present is utterly inadequate. The poverty program is too small. The program for schools to replace inferior slum schools is too frequently nonexistent. It is not the riots in the slums, but these lame and inadequate programs that are the real disgrace of the richest nation on earth.

We in Congress must provide hope of employment to young men and women. We must try to give them adequate job training. We must improve the schools. We must improve housing conditions. We must act with determination in providing the money and the planning to rub out conditions in slum neighborhoods which give rise to the ugly rioting which afflicted our cities over the summer and last year. We must be determined in this task.

Mr. President, the pending legislation authorizes the expenditure of three billion five hundred million dollars by the Office of Economic Opportunity and other Federal agencies involved in the war on poverty. This legislative proposal if enacted into law will help create an estimated 200,000 additional jobs during 1968 and 250,000 during 1969. It is designed to help those who need help—Americans with incomes near or below the poverty level who are not able to find jobs in regular competitive employment, and those young men and women with little or no work experience or with a low level of education or with no occupational skills. Let us face it, this is just the beginning—a mere down payment—of what must eventually be invested in programs to restore our cities and to enable all Americans to live in dignity. The longer we delay, the more we procrastinate, the higher the eventual total cost will be.

Mr. President, in the past I have been critical of the administration of some of the programs in the war on poverty, particularly the Job Corps. However, it is encouraging that the committee has included in the proposed bill provisions for closer supervision of the administration of these programs and for greater coordination between the various agencies administering them. This bill is very definitely a needed improvement over previous legislation in this area.

Mr. President, no individual—not a Rap Brown nor a Stokely Carmichael—

no one—could cause what happened in Detroit and Newark this year or in Watts 2 years ago, just as no one individual could have stopped what occurred in the 13 colonies in 1776. Those very foolish short-sighted persons who say that the rioting resulted from the war on poverty are 100 percent wrong. Poverty, not the war on poverty, was the basic cause of this rioting.

Some 2,300 years ago the great philosopher Plato termed poverty as the parent of meanness and viciousness and urged that rulers do away with it. He wrote:

It would be strange indeed in any state even tolerably ordered if the poor were to be utterly neglected and allowed to fall into utter destruction.

In attacking the roots of poverty there must be adequate provisions for anti-poverty programs, rent supplements, better housing, a model cities program, a Teacher Corps and for training such as the civilian conservation corps of more than 34 years ago. It is a legislative failure and madness not to enact such measures particularly when we are spending more than two billion five hundred million dollars each month to fight in an ugly civil war in Vietnam.

#### POCAHONTAS' REVENGE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, any American who has traveled to Central or South America and eaten or drunk tap water there knows what is meant by Montezuma's revenge. This does not compare with what might be called Pocahontas' revenge, for it was the American Indians who introduced tobacco to the settlers from the Old World. Pure nicotine is one of the most potent natural poisons; it is rapidly absorbed through the skin, on which a few drops may be fatal. It is used as an insecticide, and before World War II, more tobacco was consumed in the manufacture of nicotine insecticides than for smoking. Now the situation is reversed. We use other poisons for the insects and reserve the tobacco for ourselves. It is estimated that each year 40,000 Americans die from lung cancer traceable to cigarette smoking. This, in addition to those deaths from heart disease caused or aggravated by smoking.

More stringent Federal regulation of cigarette advertising and sales is necessary to protect millions of young Americans who have not yet caught the smoking habit. I support proposed legislation which would limit cigarette advertising on television and radio to late hours to avoid young audiences, require a stronger warning on cigarette packs, and impose a higher tax on those cigarettes containing high tar and nicotine content.

Mr. President, were tobacco to be introduced today as a new drug, it would be considered poisonous, and its distribution would most certainly be greatly regulated by officials of the Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TERRIFIED VIETNAMESE CHILD

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in recent weeks two Cleveland radio and television stations, WKYC, which is an NBC station, and WJW, a CBS station, have been taking polls of their viewers and listeners on the question, "Do you believe that the U.S. military forces should be withdrawn from Vietnam now?" Station WJW received more than 14,000 telephone calls and announced that 59.5 percent voted for withdrawal of our Armed Forces from Vietnam with 40.5 percent voting against. Then, shortly after this poll had been taken over WJW's Channel 8, WKYC, the NBC station, asked this same question of its viewers and listeners. Officials of television station WKYC reported that 72 percent of those telephoning or writing the station announced themselves in favor of withdrawal of our Armed Forces from Vietnam and only 28 percent were opposed.

Just recently, on Walter Cronkite's television broadcast, David Schumacher quoted a colonel of the U.S. Marines in combat in the northerly part of South Vietnam. The Marine colonel said:

The people around here all hate us and you can hardly blame them. We burn down their huts, run our half-tracks over their rice fields to destroy their crops, then send them to refugee camps in some other part of their country.

There was also recently published in our newspapers a picture of a marine in combat directly south of the demilitarized zone separating North and South Vietnam. He was tying a blindfold over the eyes of a Vietnamese boy of 10 years of age who had just been captured by our Marines. One hundred and fifty dollars in money was found on the little boy. It was charged that the little fellow was either a terrorist or a VC and the money found was proof of that. The boy explained that his father had just sold his entire rice crop and had given the youngster the money to keep, believing that our soldiers would not search such a small youngster. The terrified boy was searched, blindfolded, and his hands tied behind him. Yes, it is said that the boy's father has fled from the area of the demilitarized zone and has joined the VC, or forces of the National Liberation Front.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION PRAISED

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I was happy indeed to note in the Anchorage, Alaska, Daily Times September 22 a lead editorial entitled "Courageous Agency," paying tribute to the remarkable work which has been done in Alaska by the Small Business Administration. I ask unanimous consent that that editorial

be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it is not only that the Small Business Administration has come to the assistance of Alaska in two notable disasters, the earthquake of 1964 and the flood which inundated Fairbanks and Nenana and Minto just a few weeks ago, but additionally and very importantly, the SBA has been a steady supplier of capital for Alaska's economic growth. It is my personal opinion that Alaska is particularly fortunate to have as its regional administrator, Robert E. Butler. It is my opinion, come by after close observation over a considerable period of time, that Mr. Butler is one of the most efficient administrators I have ever known in the Federal Government.

After the earthquake, Eugene P. Foley, then Administrator of the Small Business Administration, took an active personal interest in the recovery of Alaska and he was there on many occasions. In the latest disaster, Robert C. Moot, now Administrator, and Clarence Cowles, Director of the Office of Disaster Loans, have performed noteworthy and notable and helpful service. We in Alaska are grateful to the SBA.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times, Sept. 22, 1967]

#### COURAGEOUS AGENCY

There ought to be an outstanding award for the Small Business Administration in Alaska. It should be presented, with fanfare and ceremony for all to see, by the entire state and more especially the citizens of Anchorage and Fairbanks.

This agency is the hero in the "rescue" operations that revived the state's two largest cities after disasters, Anchorage after the earthquake in 1964 and Fairbanks after the flood of last month.

Many federal, state, and local government agencies and private organizations came to the aid of the stricken cities and many rendered memorable service. But most of them were doing the job for which they were created.

The Small Business Administration did more than that. Rule books and established procedures were inadequate in these two disasters. So the books were thrown out and procedures were dumped. The leaders made innovations in policies and shortcuts in procedures to meet the need.

This required vision, courage and confidence. People in government service rarely enhance their careers by throwing out rule books, innovating or taking shortcuts.

Residents of these two cities will be grateful forever for the vim, vigor and verve of the Small Business Administration.

In Anchorage, the agency liberalized its policies and rules for making loans to repair the homes and buildings damaged in the earthquake. Within a year the agency had approved 628 home loans totalling \$12.2 million and 642 loans to commercial enterprises totalling \$51 million, and had actually disbursed \$52.2 million.

This was the credit that enabled families to continue to live here. It was the credit that enabled business places to re-establish their operations and provide the goods and services the people required.

In Fairbanks the agency responded to the pressing needs for haste because of the approach of winter and the different conditions resulting from a flood.



Shortly after the flood waters had receded, the Small Business Administration was in full operation with a program that the city needed and could get nowhere else. The agency offered unsecured loans up to \$3,000 to anyone who had flood damage and announced that additional credit would be available for those who required it.

This enabled the residents to act immediately to clean up and fix up their properties before the cold of winter moved in and made repairs impossible. The decision to increase the amount of the unsecured loans upset the normal ceiling of \$1,000 and exceeded the expectations of the people of Fairbanks. The agency had been asked to grant \$2,500 loans and, via telephone from Washington, the ceiling was set at \$3,000 the same day the request was made.

Who could ask for more cooperation or faster action?

Even without the distinction earned in the two disasters the Small Business Administration is worthy of special recognition. The agency is a source of credit and, like every frontier, this frontierland needs credit on liberal terms. Small business loans have enabled many new enterprises to come into being to provide goods, services and employment in places where all three have been sorely lacking.

Credit has always been hard to find in Alaska. For 90 years as a territory, this area had virtually none. Nobody would loan to a peculiar place that was run by a czar called the Secretary of the Interior.

Since statehood, capital has been interested in a limited sort of way. Things are better and the future looks still better.

But all would be different had the Small Business Administration not made it possible for Anchorage and Fairbanks to come back from their disasters. Deterioration in their economies would have led to a shriveling of the transportation systems and all the commercial establishments that supported them. Population would be less. Demands would be less. Life would be a step or two back toward the isolation and hardships of a generation ago.

A major part of the success in overcoming the two disasters must be attributed to the vision, courage, and efficiency of the Small Business Administration.

### THE PEACE CORPS IN KOREA

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, earlier this year, while in Korea as a representative of the United States at the inauguration of President Park, I met and visited with a number of U.S. Peace Corps volunteers serving in that country. As in other countries I have visited, I found these Americans, headed by their outstanding Director, Kevin O'Donnell, doing very necessary, dedicated, and much-appreciated work.

Peace Corps in Korea is now 1 year old. Recently, Mr. O'Donnell wrote me, setting forth future plans and enclosing articles from Korean English-language newspapers on the occasion of Peace Corps' first anniversary in Korea. I believe that Senators will want to read the letter and the articles and will do so with pride. I therefore ask unanimous consent they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 18, 1967.

HON. FRED R. HARRIS,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR FRED: As Peace Corps completed its first year in Korea, the English Language newspapers noted our anniversary. Having

visited us in Korea during this first year, we thought you might be interested in reading these news stories, so we would like to share them with you.

The next four months will see PC/K expand greatly. In October about 90 more Volunteers will arrive to teach English in the Middle Schools (Junior High). In December, 100 Volunteers are due. This will be the first group of Rural Health Auxiliaries who will assist the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs in opening and staffing Health Sub Centers at the Myon (county) level. The MESA has a five year program of taking Health Services out into the rural areas.

In January, 1968, forty more Volunteer English teachers will arrive to take up teaching assignments in Middle Schools, also in January, fifty additional Health Volunteers are expected.

At the start of 1968, PC/K will number about 400 PCV's. To support these PCV's, we are regionalizing our organization. Regional Directors will be assigned to Taegu, Taejon, Chun Chon and Kwang Ju. We are assigning physicians to Taegu and Kwang Ju to care for the PCV's personal health needs, and have added one Doctor to our Seoul Staff.

The continuing warm and enthusiastic cooperation and assistance extended PC/K by the Koreans is a testimony to the first group's performance. They have demonstrated that young Americans, living under hardship conditions in a strange land, and facing difficult language barriers, can nevertheless be of meaningful assistance to the host country and truly promote understanding between people.

Thanking you for your interest in Peace Corps, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

KEVIN O'DONNELL,  
Director.

[From the Korea Herald, Sept. 16, 1967]  
NOT LUSTY, BUT SOUND—PEACE CORPS HERE  
1 YEAR

(By Ho-Chol Shin)

Just one year ago, 100 U.S. Peace Corps volunteers came to Korea for 20 months of field service. The Peace Corps Korea 1, as the project is called, is to observe the first anniversary of its arrival today.

The Peace Corps Korea 1, now just one year old, is still not exactly a lusty infant but its cradle rocks more energetically now and, it is growing fast and sound.

In retrospect, the Peace Corps in Korea changed considerably during the past year in terms of quantity and quality.

Despite the energetic and vigorous leadership of Director Kevin O'Donnell and Deputy Director Loren Cox, 13 volunteers dropped out of the 100-member first group. But with 26 volunteers added in July, the Peace Corps family swelled to 113.

O'Donnell said the 13 volunteers resigned, mainly because of health problems and the difficulties found in the course of adjusting themselves to the Korean life.

By now, however, the volunteers feel no "culture shock" in Korea as they were warned about, he said.

The past year was a period of hardship for many volunteers, but at the same time, it was a period of harvest for three couples who were married in the countryside. A volunteer in Pusan became engaged to a Korean girl last June.

Looking back on the past year as a leader of the volunteers, Kevin O'Donnell said, "We all have learned much about Korea and its people, and we have been much impressed by the warm and enthusiastic cooperation we have received from the people."

He added, "Additional requests for more volunteers by the Korean government leads us to believe that the U.S. Peace Corps is able to assist Korea."

Deputy director Loren Cox recalls, "We had a lot of problems and difficulties at the be-

ginning of the program, but we solved them in cooperation with the Korean authorities and the people."

The unstinted efforts and good leadership shown by the staff members of the Peace Corps have been commendable, indeed.

Staff members toured thousands of miles across the country to encourage the volunteers and to see how they were working with their assigned jobs.

When one enters the office of the Peace Corps housed at the Sports Center, the first thing facing him will be a huge photograph of President Chung Hee Park, not U.S. President Lyndon B. Johnson.

This well indicates how they are thinking and what they want to do here in Korea, halfway around the world from their own country.

"In a word," O'Donnell said. "We have come here to serve the Korean people, not to lead them."

It was in a hotel suite that three staff members opened a Peace Corps office in August last year. It was one month before the first group of 100 members arrived in Seoul.

The office moved to a foreigner's home and later to a suite of rooms provided by the Education Ministry in the Sports Center. Here the staff members worked for three months without telephone service.

But now, a staff of 23 works hard with typewriter keys to care for 113 volunteers serving as teachers at 113 colleges, high schools and middle schools throughout the country.

The Peace Corps recently established regional branches in Taejon, Kwangju, Chuncheon and Taegu to expedite communications between the volunteers teaching in their respective areas of responsibility.

[From the Korea Times, Sept. 16, 1967]  
ONE-YEAR-OLD PEACE CORPS—"SINCERITY TO LEARN"

(By Park Nyon-su)

The sight of young Americans mingling with Koreans in makkolli houses or on the streets and talking with them in Korean has not been an unfamiliar one these days. These young Americans are Peace Corps volunteers.

The first group of 100 Peace Corps volunteers arrived in Korea a year ago today and the second group of 26 last month at the request of Korean government. The volunteers have served in 43 towns as teachers of English, science, and physical education, 11 of them in colleges.

The 116 Peace Corps volunteers residing throughout Korea live with Korean families, eat Korean food, teach Korean students, and try to do everything the way Koreans do "in an effort to know Korea and its people better," according to Kevin O'Donnell, director of the Peace Corps in Korea.

"We have gained a greater understanding of the Korean people and the problems Korea is facing, and we expect our mutual understanding will help tighten the friendship between the two countries," said O'Donnell.

The Peace Corps director in Korea said that he is happy to see the volunteers are doing well in spite of many difficulties they face here.

Of the 126 volunteers who came to Korea, six were sent home because of health problems and another six left because of adaptation problems such as the language barrier and differences in food and customs.

Mr. and Mrs. Edward Baker are one of 11 married couples among the Peace Corps volunteers, and they live with a Korean family in Chegi-dong, Seoul. He teaches English at the College of Education, Seoul National University, and she at the Attached High School, SNU.

Baker said that he volunteered for the Peace Corps to see foreign countries and

their peoples. But the Bakers found they could not travel widely because they had neither enough time nor money to do so.

But the Bakers said they enjoyed life in Korea where the people are hospitable, the landscape is beautiful, and the customs are interesting.

Peace Corps volunteers coming to Korea suffer many difficulties, the Bakers said.

The first difficulty is being conspicuous, the husband said. A volunteer cannot go anywhere without being watched by staring eyes.

Second difficulty is the sense of separation resulting from the language barrier, Mrs. Baker said. "Sometimes I felt like a complete stranger even in my classrooms. The students often do not show any response to my lecture, and at those moments I wonder if they understand me," she said.

The third difficulty comes from Korean foods. The Bakers do not like hot food. When they really hanker for American food, they go out to restaurants even though they know that even there they will not be able to eat "real" American food.

The popularity of the American teachers among Korean students is rising with the time, said a fellow teacher of Mrs. Baker.

"At first, the students seemed reluctant to approach the American teacher, apparently in shame over their poor English. When they saw the American teacher speak in Korean instead of English, they seemed pleased and began to approach her," said the teacher.

Kim Hak-jun, vice principal of Kyonggi Middle School, said of John Middleton, a Peace Corps volunteer teaching English at the school, that he is as helpful to other English teachers as to the students.

Kang Kyong-gu, chief of the international education division of the Ministry of Education, said that the volunteers have done better in Korea than were expected "through their sincerity to learn and understand Korea and its people and through the desire to readjust themselves to the new environment."

He regretted, however, that more than 10 percent of the volunteers returned home early "apparently due to insufficient training before coming to Korea."

### THE CRIME GAME

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on Thursday, September 21, 1967, the Washington Post published an excellent editorial entitled "The Crime Game." The last paragraph of this editorial reads:

In the final analysis, the kind of crime that now most worries the American people, the kind of crime that makes them fearful of walking at night in the streets of their cities, is not organized crime at all but random, violent, individual street crime—robbery, rape, assault, wanton homicide, offenses to which electronic eavesdropping is totally irrelevant. Congress can do something about this kind of crime—not by sniping at an Attorney General who has demonstrated extraordinary sensitivity to the problem but by enacting the Safe Streets bill which the President has submitted to it. The responsibility now rests on the Hill.

As the whole editorial is so provocative, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,  
Sept. 21, 1967]

### THE CRIME GAME

Make a silly accusation and you're pretty likely to get a silly response. Recently a Republican Task Force pointed a blunderbuss at the Department of Justice and let fly with a load of political birdshot to the effect

that the Department has been indifferent to organized crime in the United States. The Attorney General, as well aware as any Republican that there is going to be a national election next year, fired back the other day with a couple of barrels of statistics indicating that racketeers are being prosecuted and convicted far faster than they can flee the public.

The Republican rhetoric charged the Attorney General with "an incredible retreat in the war on criminal activity" because of "hamstringing of Federal agents" by his order forbidding the use of electronic eavesdropping devices. The Attorney General's modest retort to this was that "the Department of Justice is mounting an attack on organized crime which is unequalled in its dimensions and unparalleled in its results." And he added what seems to us somewhat dubious, that "in the final analysis for law enforcement, it is convictions that count."

Convictions are a help, of course. But in the final analysis, they are an acknowledgment of law enforcement failure. In the final analysis, it is prevention of crime that counts. And a diminishing rate of prosecution and conviction could be the healthiest of indices.

The attack and the answer represent, in some degree, a playing of "the crime game" on either side. Statistics in this area are notoriously unreliable and can be cited to prove almost any point. Besides, they tell only a fraction of the story. As the President's Crime Commission pointed out, "Offense and arrest figures do not aid very much in analyzing the scope of professional crime. . . . Although the police statistics indicate a lot of crime today, they do not begin to indicate the full amount. . . . The actual amount of crime in the United States today is several times that reported in the Uniform Crime Reports."

Moreover, the Republican Task Force attacks the Attorney General for what is precisely the most praiseworthy part of his performance. He has insisted, as no other Attorney General from Tom Clark to Ramsey Clark has insisted, that the investigating agencies of the Federal Government observe the law in enforcing the law. He has accorded respect to the right of privacy fundamental to all freedom by forbidding Federal agents to employ taps and bugs in violation of Federal and local laws. The attack on crime is in no way weakened by this signal commitment to human decency and constitutional command.

In the final analysis, the kind of crime that now most worries the American people, the kind of crime that makes them fearful of walking at night in the streets of their cities, is not organized crime at all but random, violent, individual street crime—robbery, rape, assault, wanton homicide, offenses to which electronic eavesdropping is totally irrelevant. Congress can do something about this kind of crime—not by sniping at an Attorney General who has demonstrated extraordinary sensitivity to the problem but by enacting the Safe Streets bill which the President has submitted to it. The responsibility now rests on the Hill.

### LAKE COUNTY QUARTERLY COURT ENDORSES REVENUE SHARING

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am much pleased to report that the Lake County Quarterly Court has unanimously endorsed S. 1236, the Federal revenue-sharing proposal which I introduced on March 9.

It is important to have the support of local governmental officials for this effort to rebuild and revitalize State and local governments.

Because I think it is important that the continuing development of local government interest in revenue sharing be noticed by this body, I ask unanimous

consent to place the court's resolution in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### RESOLUTION 2

(Resolution of Senate bill 1236)

Whereas, Senator Howard Baker has requested the Court to recommend that his Senate Bill #1236 proposing to return part of the federal revenue to the State and local governments for their use without strings attached.

Now, therefore be it resolved, that the Lake County Quarterly Court go on record as being in favor of Senate Bill #1236 by Senator Baker.

Motion by Mr. E. A. Peacock, Jr., seconded by Mr. Fred A. Wortman that said resolution be adopted.

### ROLLCALL

For: Floyd Flowers, James Hearn, Robert Henley, Ira Holloway, Woodrow Leggett, J. W. Lovings, Joe K. Miller, Jimm Moore, E. A. Peacock Jr., Frank Provow, Cornell Rhodes, Maynard Scott, Fred A. Wortman.

Against: None.

Yes, 13.

No, 0.

Resolution adopted.

State of Tennessee, Lake County: I, J. G. Shull, Clerk of the County Court of Lake County, Tennessee do hereby certify the above Resolution to be a true copy of Resolution # 2 adopted by the Lake County Quarterly Court at a Special Session on Sept. 18, 1967, said resolution is recorded in Quarterly Court Minute Book "3", page "125", in the office of County Court Clerk.

Witness my seal and signature of office this 18th day of September, 1967.

[SEAL]

J. G. SHULL,  
County Court Clerk.

### LAW STUDENT FROM PENNSYLVANIA WRITES LETTER ON SEPARATION OF POWERS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on September 15, 1967, the Washington Evening Star published a lengthy and erudite letter on "The Separation of Powers," written by one of our bright young men from Pennsylvania who have come to Washington to continue their graduate and professional studies. The author of this letter, Mr. Bernard Yanavich, Jr., is a native of Luzerne County, Pa., and is a law student at the Catholic University of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Yanavich's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### THE SEPARATION OF POWERS

SIR: The Fulbright Resolution on Foreign Relations introduced in the Senate has sown the seed of controversy. But the resulting tree branches out far beyond the field of foreign relations. Its roots go far beyond the peripheral eroded present and seek the refreshing reservoirs and good soil of the sound constitutional doctrines of the past. I am talking about the separation of powers.

When we deal with the Constitution, we are dealing with a highly academic subject. This is not a case of departmental jealousy, this is a case of re-examining the Constitution of the United States, of determining what the supreme law of the land says, and then of obeying that law. I like the sound thinking of Senator Wayne Morse, a former law professor and dean of a law school, when he pleaded that "we return to the real meaning of the Constitution."



As the controversy began with foreign policy, consider first that part of the Constitution which concerns relations and agreements with other countries:

Article II Section 2 says:

"The President . . . shall have power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors . . ."

#### SENATE PLAYS LARGE ROLE

At once it is evident that the Senate is to play a large role in foreign policy. It not only must ratify all treaties, but it must also confirm the appointments of those who are to work in foreign relations. The division and limitation, the separation of powers is the very base of the constitutional system for foreign policy.

What is the meaning of "treaty"? I refer again to the thinking of the distinguished senior senator from Oregon. While testifying before the special Subcommittee on the Separation of Powers, Senator Morse answered in the affirmative to this question by Senator Sam Ervin: "As I interpret you, it is your conviction that the treaty-making provisions of the Constitution require the submission to the Senate in the form of a treaty of any agreement negotiated by the executive branch of the government which requires either an appropriation or legislation by Congress for its implementation?"

A two-thirds vote of the Senate and not a joint resolution of Congress is what is required by the Constitution.

The Senate as representatives of the people must share with the executive the constitutional responsibility for the making of American foreign policy. Speaking in defense of the Constitutional system, Senator Morse defines what the other much-used device, the executive agreement, should mean: "The power of the President to make independent executive agreements is power merely to carry out and implement the policy of the nation which has been adopted in a proper fashion; that is by concurrence of the President and the Senate."

#### RETURN TO SPIRIT

From my reading of the Constitution I conclude that Senator Fulbright's resolution advocates not a modification of the Constitution, as a noted columnist insisted, but a return to the spirit and letter of the supreme law of the land.

Now to the greater problem, the gradual erosion of the protecting shield of the Constitution. The Congress and not the Executive Branch has the power under Article I, Section 8 "to declare War," "to raise and support Armies," "to provide and maintain a Navy," and "to provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions."

The Congress has the supposed power of the purse. Yet time and again Congress has yielded its many powers to the Executive Branch under the pressures of "prior commitments." At the present time no one seriously doubts that the Executive alone can involve us in war, but the power to declare war is in the Congress. No one doubts that the Executive can get a tax hike, a foreign aid appropriation, an appropriation for a greater army, etc., with little or no difficulty, though these are powers vested in the Congress. No longer is it a question of what the Congress considers priorities, but what the Executive considers emergencies.

#### "USURPATION"

Advocates of the Executive department's "usurpation" (I prefer Senator Morse's term over Senator Church's "circumvention") of powers granted to the Congress by the Constitution use as a precedent the dangerous but necessary tendency toward practically unlimited power to meet the dire national emergencies of hellzapoppin yesterdays.

These precedents were upheld by the Supreme Court in language which indicates the temporary-only character of the powers.

Different thinking by the court in 1952 produced the Youngstown case in which Mr. Justice Black stated: "The founders of this nation entrusted the lawmaking power to the Congress alone in both good and bad times."

Mr. Justice Frankfurter gave this interpretation to the same case: "A scheme of government like ours no doubt at times feels the lack of power to act with complete, all-embracing, swiftly-moving authority. No doubt a government with distributed authority . . . labors under restrictions from which other governments are free. In any event our government was designed to have such restrictions. The price was deemed not too high in view of the safeguards which these restrictions afford."

The safeguards, as every schoolboy is taught, are the separation of powers, the checks and balances, the delegations of duties carefully written into the Constitution. It goes without saying that these safeguards must be acknowledged unless the Constitution is amended. Senator Morse summed it up in the best statement I have heard:

"It is about time that we return to the Constitution and make clear that boys are not going to be sent to die on battlefields anywhere in the world unless our Presidents follow Constitutional processes."

BERNARD A. YANAVICH, Jr.

#### THE NEED TO UPDATE THE U.S. FISHING FLEET

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to make additional remarks in support of Senate Joint Resolution 104, which I introduced along with several other Senators on August 14.

Along with the sad plight of our merchant marine in cargo-carrying capability, the long-ignored fishing fleet should be included in efforts to update our seagoing vessels. Where once the United States led the world in fishing, it now ranks fifth. The fishing industry is a vast one, ranging from Maine to the gulf and all along the Pacific coast. Our waters contain vast amounts of almost every kind of fish that we use. However, we now import more than 60 percent of the fisheries products. This figure is certainly noteworthy. The existing conditions among the fishing fleets do not allow us to take full advantage of one of the richest sources of food that the Nation possesses.

The fact is that the United States should lead the world in commercial fishing; but without more adequate fishing vessels, this simply cannot be done. Fishing fleets are also valuable auxiliaries to the merchant marine as has been proven many times in the past. It would certainly be in the best interest of the Nation to set a policy of development for its fishing industry.

I firmly believe that such a proposal should rightly be included in the study called for in Senate Joint Resolution 104. With sound proposals from these parties with a vital interest in all phases of the merchant marine, I hope that we can develop a viable system in this area. It is essential that we do.

#### IMPORTATION OF TEXTILES

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on September 26, the Charleston News and

Courier published an editorial concerning the most serious economic problem facing my State today—the excessive importation of foreign textiles. The editorial was entitled, appropriately, "Two-Faced on Textiles," and in the short space of some 300 words cogently expressed the dismay of South Carolinians over the ambiguous policy of the administration with regard to textiles.

The statement made by the Vice President recently in Greenville, S.C., reaffirming the administration's supposed support of this essential industry and pledging to "take whatever steps are necessary to save the industry and to make it expand," borders on the incredible when coupled with assurances made to the Japanese 1 week earlier that the administration opposed quota limitations on foreign textiles.

I congratulate the News and Courier on this perceptive editorial, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### TWO-FACED ON TEXTILES

In dealing with problems of the textile industry, the Johnson administration presents two faces. One can be seen in a recent statement by Vice President Hubert Humphrey. The other is discerned in the administration's private assurances to Japanese officials.

During his recent visit to South Carolina's textile-manufacturing center, Mr. Humphrey declared:

"This administration will not allow the textile industry to be weakened or depressed. We will take whatever steps are necessary to save the industry and to make it expand."

This statement has a hollow note in view of Sen. Ernest F. Hollings' report Sept. 15 that the U.S. State Department has assured Japanese officials that the administration opposes the textile import quota bills pending in Congress.

For years, the State Department has regarded the textile industry as expendable in negotiations with the Japanese. The Johnson administration apparently still hews to this line, no matter what Mr. Humphrey says on a political expedition to textile country.

If the interests of the textile companies and their employees are to be protected, Congress will have to provide the protection. Indeed protection of an industry is the business of the Congress, for the Constitution gives the legislative branch the power to regulate commerce.

It is encouraging that Sen. Hollings now has 65 co-sponsors for his textile import quota proposal. We hope the Democratic leadership of the Senate will cooperate in obtaining passage. The textile industry—South Carolina's principal industry—deserves a measure of protection against foreign imports produced with cheap labor. The industry is not asking for a shut-off of all foreign textiles, simply a checking of the flood into U.S. markets. If the flood is not checked, an important American industry will suffer.

As for the Johnson administration, it is bound to suffer loss of public confidence if it persists in a two-faced policy. The public is not likely to be fooled by the present devious approach.

#### AMERICAN BUSINESS NEEDS TO HELP EASE POVERTY CRISIS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the mounting problems of urban America—poor education, poverty, illnesses, and

lack of job opportunities—will not be solved by governmental action alone, whether that action occurs at the Federal, State, or local level. The private sector must seek to play a role in meeting this crisis.

In the overwhelming majority of cases, American businessmen are anxious to assume their rightful role in the alleviation and elimination of urban America's plight.

Andrew Heiskell, chairman of the board of Time, Inc., delivered an excellent address in New York City on September 19 outlining the steps which some businessmen might take. While the precise steps to which Mr. Heiskell refers might not be appropriate for all corporations, I think the emphasis is correct; namely, that large private corporations and enterprises should exercise increasing interest and concern in the significant difficulties and problems of our cities.

I commend Mr. Heiskell for his remarks and I commend his address to others.

I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the New York Times of September 20, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**HEISKELL URGES U.S. COMPANIES TO RELAX HIRING RULES FOR POOR**  
(By Henry Raymond)

Andrew Heiskell, chairman of the board of Times Inc., called on the nation's corporations yesterday to lower employment standards, if necessary, to provide thousands of more jobs of people living in urban slums.

"I urgently suggest that every corporation should consider hiring, for every 100 men in its force, one man who doesn't meet their normal standards," Mr. Heiskell told a hushed audience at the annual luncheon of the Magazine Publisher Association.

He predicted the plan would be "a practical way" of closing a "credibility gap" that he said existed in the slums. The slums, he explained, doubt that private industry is interested in helping to improve economic and social conditions in American cities.

#### SEEKING NEW SOLUTIONS

Mr. Heiskell was speaking as the co-chairman of the Urban Coalition, an organization of representatives of industry, business, labor and civil-rights groups, and of local governments. The coalition was formed in Washington July 31 to find new solutions for the multiplying problems of the cities.

"They, the underprivileged, don't believe we are serious in our promises to help relieve the problems of the urban ghettos," he said. "It is perfectly clear that the first priority is jobs, and jobs which most of us are not necessarily in a position to offer.

"So we ought to break down some of the existing standards and rules so that we can hire those people who are in the greatest need and then train them while they work."

The speech drew only brief applause from the audience of about 600 magazine and advertising executives who attended the luncheon on the Starlight Roof of the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel.

After the luncheon, however, several editors went up to Mr. Heiskell to offer their co-operation and ask for details about the Urban Coalition. One of them was Mortimer Berkowitz, Jr., the burly publisher of Fowler Grower magazine, who had a bandage on his forehead.

#### ATTACK NEAR GRACIE MANSION

Explaining that he had been attacked by two youth Saturday while walking with a friend near Gracie Mansion, Mr. Berkowitz said: "I got it firsthand, I got very close to getting killed. You let me know what we can do to help, and I promise you we'll do it."

In his speech, Mr. Heiskell made an urgent plea for "all levels of society" to work together in solving the problems of the ghetto.

"Our society will not take more than three or five years of rioting every summer without the machine of government beginning to erode," he said. "If we do not solve this together there will start a wave of repression that all of us here will live to regret."

In commenting on conditions in the slums, Mr. Heiskell aligned himself with the view of Whitney Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, saying that "without justice we neither will have nor do we deserve order."

In his address, Mr. Heiskell also urged that labor unions move more rapidly to "open their ranks" to Negroes and Puerto Ricans and that private foundations set aside a third of their funds over the next three years for training programs in the slums.

Charles L. Gleason, personnel director of Time Inc., said last night that "the Heiskell hiring plan is now before the board, and we are actively discussing just how to implement it." The company has 2,500 employees in the city.

#### EXCELLENT RECORD OF THE MARYLAND DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a recent editorial in the Baltimore Sun drew my attention to a publication of the Maryland Department of Employment Security, entitled "Advance Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1967."

The report reveals an impressive array of statistics and shows that, among other things, unemployment in Maryland dropped by 4,500 in fiscal year 1967. Non-agricultural and salaried workers averaged 1,166,300—up 69,400 over the 1966 total.

There is plenty of other good news in the report. I agree with the Sun that the department of unemployment security is to be commended for making these encouraging figures available to the public as early as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Baltimore Sun editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### AN EXCELLENT RECORD

The Maryland Department of Employment Security has issued a pamphlet entitled: "Advance Annual Report, Fiscal Year 1967."

The regular reports are never issued until January or February—more than six months after the close of the year covered. No more than a glance through the advance pamphlet should be enough to explain why the department should have wanted to rush into print with the year-end facts as quickly as possible—the facts could be no better.

Through the 12-month period non-agricultural wage and salaried workers averaged 1,166,300—up 69,400 over the 1966 total. The unemployment total dropped by 4,500. The increase in the one area and the contraction in the other resulted in a reduction of \$605,000 in the amount distributed in benefits to unemployed persons who lost their jobs through no fault of their own.

From the viewpoint of the employers who

finance the full burden of unemployment compensation there are these facts: In fiscal 1967 the tax rate schedule applied against employers on the basis of their respective employment records was the lowest in the State's history of the program. The outlook for a continuation of that schedule is excellent; at the end of the year the trust fund behind the program was at its highest figure.

The array of facts in the report, and this without exception, provides good news for those in the labor markets, employers and the public generally. The advance report is welcome not only because it contains good news but it displays a desire on the part of a State agency to report quickly to the public—a desire that is rare if not unique among State departments.

#### INTERNATIONAL ESPIONAGE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Monday's edition of the State, of Columbia, S.C., contains an extremely interesting column by Henry J. Taylor. Mr. Taylor is a former U.S. Ambassador to Switzerland, and in that position he was able to see the complicated role which international espionage plays in modern history. The unique situation in Switzerland as a model country made it a particularly valuable vantage point for Mr. Taylor's observations.

In his column published in the State, Mr. Taylor draws upon his own observations and upon recent writings by Svetlana Alliluyeva to show the importance which the Soviets place upon espionage activity. I quote the last two paragraphs from Mr. Taylor's excellent article:

Former Central Intelligence Agency chief Allen W. Dulles has stated that "the Soviet had over 40 high-level agents in various Washington departments and agencies during World War II. At least this many were uncovered; we don't know how many remained undetected."

It would be inconceivable to any experienced intelligence manager that there are any fewer in decision-making places in Washington today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### COLUMNISTS RECALL SOVIET INTRIGUES: ESPIONAGE IS TRICKY BUSINESS

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Svetlana Alliluyeva's widely syndicated "Twenty Letters to a Friend" pictures her father's Kremlin from the inside. Another book, "A Man Called Lucy," by Pierre Accoce and Pierre Quet, along with my own findings in Switzerland, (while U.S. Ambassador there) shows Stalin's treasure-trove of espionage in that neutral territory with equally stark revelation.

During the wartime period Svetlana writes about, the Soviet did not have diplomatic relations with Switzerland. But a blond, anti-Nazi giant named Hans Bernd Gisevius who was a vice-consul at the German legation in Bern under the direction of Hitler's secret service, became a pipe line to us. So did another sympathetic anti-Nazi, an assistant to German Ambassador Koehler. This was an "unvetted source," a man who remains as mysterious and unidentified to his employers (our country) as to the enemy against whom he works.

The cafe Grief in Zurich was a center for interenemy agents and transient refugees,



and courageous U.S. Army Colonel Barnwell R. Legge, our military attache at Bern, practically controlled this center.

The Swiss Army's Brigadier-Colonel Roger Masson, in turn, chief of Swiss counterintelligence, was in contact with German S. S. Brigadeführer Walter Schellenberg who ultimately emerged a hero of the German anti-Hitler movement.

We passed their information on to Stalin. What we never knew was that Stalin had his own immensely successful espionage apparatus in Lausanne, the information output of which was astounding and would have saved countless American lives. Stalin couldn't have helped us less if he had been Hitler himself. The Soviet simply stood by, took everything and gave nothing.

German Communists call an agent "kaltegestalt" in the technical jargon of Soviet espionage if the man is "on ice" between missions. German Communists had penetrated the highest levels of the German army, navy and air force general staffs and even Hitler's personal entourage. Moreover, the German Communists had about 20 German resident directors trained at the Soviet spy school at Sekhjdnya and operating espionage centers throughout wartime Germany. They controlled some 300 German Communist agents. But they faced the problem of communicating with the Kremlin.

A remarkably able Red agent named Rudolph Roessler was "kaltegestalt" in Berlin and the German Communist party faithful sent him under cover to Lausanne. Red agents often confirm their contacts by producing currency notes that bear consecutive serial numbers. Roessler provided this identification to comrade "Leon," the head of the Communist party in Switzerland. Leon set up Roessler and a Moscow-beamed radio in Lausanne and supplied him a group of helpers based in Geneva.

Relaying the top-level information received from the Communists inside Germany, the Lausanne nest established what was designated as the "Viking Line"—direct to Stalin.

Stalin was called Koba by his few intimates. It was the code name he supplied Lausanne. The Red nest reported to him in advance, sometimes months in advance such vital secrets as Germany's seizure of Austria. It also rushed him the first hint of Hitler's decision to stage the horrible pogroms against the Jews. The Lausanne nest found this did not ruffle Stalin. He had an intense hatred of Jews and purged them on a scale proportionate to Nazi Germany, a fact implied even by Svetlana in her "Twenty Letters."

Hitler invaded Poland, the attack which precipitated World War II, on a slim pretext forged by his own secret service. The Lausanne nest forecast his move. It foretold to Stalin the invasion of Holland, Belgium, northeast France, Luxembourg, Denmark and Norway, each in advance, and sent him the first mention of V-1 and V-2 rockets that were to come, about which we knew nothing and which fell chiefly on us of the West.

The Communists burrow everywhere. And there are always Red agents and provocateurs masquerading as supporters of men in power. The prize—and priceless—information needed by these burrowers is: What will the men in power do next.

Former Central Intelligence Agency chief Allen W. Dulles has stated that "the Soviet had over 40-high-level agents in various Washington departments and agencies during World War II. At least this many were uncovered; we don't know how many remained undetected."

It would be inconceivable to any experienced intelligence manager that there are any fewer in decision-making places in Washington today.

## THE SECRET OF HAWAII

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, many visitors to Hawaii often wonder how our residents can bear to be confined to the island chain for a lifetime. Perhaps two writers from the Hartford Courant, Shirley and Bob Sloane, have discovered the answer.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hartford Courant]

### THE WAIKIKI TOURISTS SEE

(NOTE.—Two views of Hawaii, one by Shirley and Bob Sloane of the Hartford Courant and one by a writer for The Economist, help to explain the upsurge in travel to the Islands this year. See editorial.)

Hawaii may be the only place in the Western world where hotel men don't complain about the help situation.

In Europe the hand drain has become as serious as the brain drain. And if the cooks and waiters are migrating to the United States, it seems they work in tourist-type trades just long enough to learn English and then go on to bigger and better things.

Hawaii's secret is that Hawaiians simply don't leave Hawaii. Did you ever meet a Hawaiian living on the mainland? They may leave the sugar fields; who wouldn't? But it's not just because catering to tourists is easier work. It's also because they have that natural outgoing warmth travelers read about in the tourist folders of every country but rarely find. Hawaiians love people, they love life, and above all they love Hawaii.

They enjoy it so much that tourists often feel they're missing most of the fun. Oh, visitors may don muumuus and put flowers in their hair and take the daily free hula lesson on the hotel patio. But it isn't the same, and they often go back to the mainland with a defeated look about them, wondering why they don't feel like smiling, singing and dancing all the time the way the Hawaiians do.

The reasons for this attitude about Hawaii are best summed up as "What's Not to Like?"

The sun shines most of the time, and if you're a Hawaiian of Polynesian or Oriental extraction, as most are, you have enough pigment in your skin not to worry about sunburn like the malihinis do.

The surf is almost always up somewhere, and if you're Hawaiian you know how to surf. The fish are jumping, from the mahimahi off Oahu to the monster marlin on the Kona coast. And if all else fails to keep up your spirits, you turn on the radio and hula, because there's always twangy Hawaiian music playing, and if you're Hawaiian you know how to hula. You'd better—your parents probably started giving you lessons at the age of four, even if they had to go without television to pay for them.

You never, ever, dress up. The shapeless, colorful muumuu covers everything and touches nothing, so ladies happily eat and get fat. They've been asked whether it's true people wear hats and gloves in New York and Chicago. There is only one restaurant in all the islands that requires men to wear coats and ties, the Monarch Room of the venerable Royal Hawaiian Hotel. But the performers are barefooted and aloha-shirted. No wonder they think mainlanders are nuts.

The well known racial mixture of Hawaii—Polynesian, Chinese, Japanese, Korean and Filipino, with dashes of Portuguese, Spanish and Anglo-Saxon—makes for one of the most exotically beautiful people in the world. It also turns racial prejudice into a futile exercise for even the most dedicated bigot. Who

exactly is superior to whom, and what percentage of him?

The relaxed atmosphere makes it feasible for Hawaiians to goodnaturedly poke fun at each other's racial characteristics. Local entertainment is often studded with a kind of Polynesian calypso that takes off on the ways and manners of Japanese grocers or Chinese laundresses, to the utter delight of the locals and utter confusion of mainlanders, to whom it would be unthinkable bad taste on the mainland.

Enough Americana has been injected into Hawaii so that it is not, as might be expected, lazy-poor. Most Hawaiians happily hold down two jobs, maybe a policeman by day and an ukulele player by night. And Honolulu has been booming so that it is almost unrecognizable even if you saw it only a year ago.

Only 20 years ago there was just a handful of hotels spread across Waikiki Beach. Now new ones, as well as giant high rise condominiums, have sprung up like concrete mushrooms all over the area.

The huge Ilkai apartment-hotel complex dwarfs everything around it. The facade of the new Bank of Hawaii building is honeycombed with interlacing concrete arches. Ten minutes drive from Waikiki, the plush new Kahala Hilton surprised everyone but canny Conrad Hilton by being as successful as any Waikiki hotel ever was. And all over the volcanic mountains ringing the city, luxury housing developments climb even higher.

Because Hawaii has no clearly definable tourist seasons the way most resorts do, it is surprisingly reasonable, and prices are the same all year. Rooms in every luxury hotel cost hardly more than half what is charged in comparable Florida or Caribbean resorts, and comfortable modest apartment hotels off the beach, often with cooking facilities, offer accommodation for as little as \$8 and \$10 a room.

Food tastes have been standardized to either Oriental or simple American-modern, with the result that even a full course steak dinner in a top restaurant should cost no more than about \$7. And there are many cheaper.

Hawaiians don't want to milk the tourists and get rich. They get their milk from coconuts and were born rich. What's not to like?

## THE AMERICAN LEGION BOYS NATION

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, President Johnson recently welcomed the 100 delegates to the 1967 Boys Nation to Washington and to the White House with the following greeting:

I'm glad to welcome you to this capital and to this house. The American Legion is to be commended for giving young Americans like you a chance to learn first-hand about their government.

Fifty years ago, in Paris, after the close of World War I, approximately 1,000 officers and enlisted men of the AEF organized what was to become the American Legion; today the largest veterans organization in the United States, 2½ million members strong. In those early days, they associated themselves together "for God and country"; nearly 50 years and three wars later, they remain associated "for God and country."

One of the principal objectives of the American Legion has been "to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy." To the men and women of the Legion and its auxiliary, there seemed no better way

to do this than through the youth of America. For this purpose, in 1935, Illinois held the first boys state. This is a program designed to teach the young men of our Nation the principles of democracy and to show them the processes by which their State governments operate. By 1946, this program had spread to every State in the Nation and in that year, the first Boys Nation was held in Washington, D.C.

The American Legion has just concluded its 22d annual Boys Nation. One hundred young men from 49 States and the District of Columbia gathered together to learn about the workings of their Government. Twenty-five dedicated legionnaires, who give their time and energies and devotion to this program year after year, were on hand to guide them. The Boys Nation delegates formed themselves into two political parties, each with its own platform and candidates for president and vice president. They held an election, and this year's young president happens also to be the winner of the Legion's 1967 national oratorical contest; more than that, he is the first Negro to attain the highest position in either program.

The Boys Nation delegates are here for just 1 week, but the effects of their experiences are far more lasting.

The American Legion will in 1969 celebrate its 50th year as an organization dedicated to the service of "community, State, and Nation." It is my understanding that the Legion will petition the Postmaster General for the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp.

I urge the Postmaster General and his advisers to give every consideration to this request. I feel certain they will find the American Legion richly deserves this signal honor.

#### U.S. FOREIGN TRADE POLICY— RESOLUTIONS OF SOUTHERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, at the 33d annual meeting of the Southern Governors' Conference held this month in Asheville, N.C., two very important resolutions relating to U.S. foreign trade policy were adopted.

The first resolution requests the Congress to enact pending textile legislation and urges the administration to fully implement its textile program and establish arrangements to fairly control access to the U.S. market by foreign supplies.

The policy of controlling excessive imports which seriously affect domestic industry was initiated three decades ago at the recommendation of a special Presidential study committee. Since then it has been continued and reinforced by both Democratic and Republican administrations alike. Under President Johnson, this policy has been extended until September 1970.

But such trade policy as it applies to textiles has been only partially implemented by the imposition of import quotas on raw and processed cotton fiber and by domestic subsidies for wool production. Effective steps have not yet been taken to properly control access to the U.S. market by foreign suppliers of man-

made fiber, woolen, and silk textile products. Congress, however, has before it proposed legislation, of which I am proud to be a cosponsor, which would establish such controls. It is this legislation, cosponsored by 60 Members of the Senate and 135 Members of the House, that the Governors of 13 Southern States have unanimously recommended be enacted.

The second resolution opposes implementation of the agreement relating principally to chemicals supplementary to the Geneva—1967—protocol to the GATT. This agreement, commonly known as the "separate package" agreement, would repeal the American selling price method of customs valuation and still further lower U.S. tariffs on benzenoid chemicals in excess of the 50-percent reduction authorized under the Trade Expansion Act.

In these negotiations, the U.S. negotiators agreed to reduce tariffs on all chemicals by approximately 50 percent in return for a 20-percent reduction by the European Economic Community and United Kingdom. Under the "separate package" they would equal our 50-percent cut—but only if Congress first agrees to eliminate the American selling price system and still further lower chemical tariffs. The United States is, in effect, asked to pay for the same horse twice. The Governors' conference, by their resolution, urges Congress to reject this supplemental agreement on the grounds that it is clearly unreciprocal and would endanger the jobs of thousands of benzenoid chemical workers located in 450 benzenoid chemical plants throughout the South.

Mr. President, I should like to stress that both of these resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Governors. The textile and chemical industries form the backbone of our southern economy and are continuously expanding to provide more jobs and a better way of life for our people. To export these jobs and our standard of living to foreign producers who compete not on the basis of efficiency, but on substantially lower wage costs would be pure folly. I ask unanimous consent that both resolutions, which were unanimously adopted by the 33d annual Southern Governors' Conference, be printed in the RECORD. I hope that Congress will take careful note of the sentiments expressed by our Governors.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CHEMICALS

Whereas, the Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations will seriously and adversely affect the domestic chemical industry, which includes many firms with plants and offices in States which are members of this Conference; and

Whereas, the implementation of the Agreement Relating Principally to Chemicals, Supplementary to the Geneva (1967) Protocol, including the repeal of the American Selling Price method of customs valuation, would have additional serious and adverse effect on the domestic chemical industry and on its operations in said States and the workers and communities in which they are located; and

Whereas, the proposed foreign tariff reduction which would be gained as a result of

implementation of said Supplementary Agreement will not offer any significant opportunity to increase chemical export sales:

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Southern Governors' Conference that the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, including the Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations, and each member of the Congress, be advised that the Southern Governors' Conference:

(1) firmly opposes implementation, by legislation or otherwise, of said Supplementary Agreement including the repeal of the American Selling Price method of customs valuation; and

(2) urges that the Congress of the United States conduct a thorough study to determine the effects of the multilateral tariff reductions in the Kennedy Round upon the worldwide competitive position of the domestic chemical industry and the U.S. balance of payments before any further trade negotiations are undertaken by the U.S. government; and

Be it further resolved that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the members of Congress, and to William M. Roth, the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

#### TEXTILES

Whereas, thirty-two years ago the President of the United States recognized the adverse effect upon the domestic textile industry of excessive textile imports into the United States and directed that a study be made of the situation by a committee and that recommendations should be made to him as to how the matter should be handled; and

Whereas, the finding of this committee was that a voluntary agreement should be entered into between the principal exporter, Japan, and the United States; and

Whereas, it is particularly significant that the author of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement concept, former Secretary of State Cordell Hull, was a member of the committee making this recommendation to the President in 1935, and so it may be accurately stated that concurrent with the inception of the Reciprocal Trade Agreement policy of our Government was the recognition that it is both desirable and necessary to control excessive textile imports when they are seriously affecting the domestic industry; and

Whereas, this established principle of the foreign trade policy of the United States was given further recognition and implementation in 1956 when President Eisenhower directed that steps be taken to limit Japanese cotton textile exports to the United States, and a voluntary arrangement with Japan was entered into for a period of five years, 1957-1961; and

Whereas, continuity of this principle was recognized when, upon the expiration of this five-year arrangement in 1961, a one-year extension was negotiated; and

Whereas, there was a full awareness of these historical facts when President Kennedy inaugurated his seven-point program on May 2, 1961, under which program there was negotiated a one-year short-term cotton textile arrangement by the United States and 18 other signatory nations, and in 1962, there was negotiated a five-year long-term cotton textile arrangement (LTA) among 29 nations and the United States, running from October 1, 1962, to September 30, 1967, that this further established said principle as an ingrained part of the foreign trade policy of the United States, which has this year been projected into the future by the extension of the LTA for a period of three years to September 30, 1970; and

Whereas, on June 30, 1961, at the time the one-year short-term cotton textile arrangement was being negotiated, President Kennedy stated:



"It should be borne in mind that the contemplated negotiations are designed as one of a series of efforts to assist the textile industry. Our objective is to assist the industry to overcome all of the handicaps which it faces. The State Department is being instructed to get the best possible relief, not only for cotton, but for other fibers."

Whereas, on October 26, 1964, President Johnson when speaking of the Administration's textile program stated:

"When this Administration took office serious difficulties confronted this industry. . . . It was determined to find answers. . . . We know the job can be done. We must now focus on the remaining weak spots and implement the rest of our program."

"I am convinced that our program for textiles is in the best interests of all America. I intend to pursue it to a successful conclusion."

Whereas, the nation's textile trade policy necessarily embraces both the textile fibers and the products made therefrom, and this policy has been partially implemented by the imposition of import quotas on raw and processed cotton fiber, and by domestic subsidies for wool production; and

Whereas, the Congress has under consideration legislation designed to establish an equitable quantity of imports of man-made fibers and man-made fiber, woolen and silk textile products cosponsored by 62 Senators and 139 Representatives; and

Whereas, to date effective steps have not been accomplished by our Government to equitably control access to the United States market by foreign suppliers of textile fibers and products made therefrom and the need to do so is all the more apparent in light of the conclusion of the Kennedy Round tariff cutting negotiations and their impact in particular upon the textile areas in the Appalachian region, which is the object of special attention by the Federal Government as well as the respective state governments:

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Southern Governors' Conference requests the Congress to enact the pending textile legislation, and the Administration to fully implement its textile program by establishing arrangements to equitably control access to the United States market by foreign suppliers of man-made fibers and textile products made of wool, silk, and man-made fibers and to administer those existing arrangements covering cotton textile products so that the best interests of our national economy and security, and the welfare of labor and management and the consuming public may best be served; and

Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, his Cabinet, the members of Congress, and to William M. Roth, the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

#### POLITICAL CAMPAIGN FINANCING

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I incorporate in the RECORD two editorials commenting upon the campaign financing bill recently approved by the Committee on Finance by a vote of 10 to 7.

One editorial, appearing in the Los Angeles Times, properly characterizes this bill as "irresponsible." The second, published in the Baltimore Sun, refers to the staggering costs of this proposal to finance political campaigns from the public Treasury, especially at a time when the budget deficit is already of enormous proportions.

I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials, published in the September 20 issue of the Los Angeles Times and the September 17 issue of the Baltimore Sun, respectively entitled "Campaign

Finance Bill Irresponsible" and "Campaign Funds," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Sept. 20, 1967]

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE BILL IRRESPONSIBLE

The campaign finance bill approved by the Senate Finance Committee is an improvement over the slapdash measure enacted by the 89th Congress—but not much.

Under its terms \$14 million would be made available to teach major party presidential nominee in the 1968 campaign, and \$26.4 million would be apportioned among the contenders for 34 senatorial seats. It can be assumed that if the bill ever reaches the House financing for that body will be included.

Additionally the bill would allow a 50% tax credit, to a maximum of \$25, for individual campaign donations as a spur to small contributors. Both presidential and congressional contenders would be required to choose between accepting the government largesse or funding their campaigns by private contributions.

The earlier bill, lacking any such restriction, proposed to raise \$30 million for each presidential nominee by permitting a \$1 checkoff on income tax returns.

Underlying motivation of both bills is that federal funding would take campaign finance out of the hands of special interest contributors who might exert undue influence on office holders.

It has been estimated that the new bill would cost the federal treasury in excess of \$100 million next year—and that is the crux of the situation at a time when the federal deficit is approaching \$30 billion.

Sen. Herman Talmadge (D-Ga.) rightly insists that "it is the height of irresponsibility for the Congress to be considering financing political campaigns when we can't balance our budget."

Surely there are many pressing problems to which the \$100 million could be devoted at this time with more profit to the people of this nation.

But there are also nagging questions in the longer range:

Is it possible to devise a system of federal financing which would not be susceptible of manipulation? How would the funds be administered and utilized. Could safeguards be drawn to prevent some politicians from getting around the dual-funding prohibition? Could the party in power during any given election resist the temptation to rejigger the ground rules to its advantage?

The motivation for the bill may be of the highest, but there are still too many inherent dangers to warrant its passage.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, Sept. 17, 1967]

#### CAMPAIGN FUNDS

In a dispatch from our Washington bureau Joseph R. L. Sterne reported that the campaign financing bill which has been approved by the Senate Finance Committee could cost the Treasury—hence the taxpayers—as much as \$74 million during a presidential election, if all the major-party candidates for the presidency, the Senate and the House of Representatives availed themselves of its terms. It should be noted that the Senate committee's bill applies only to presidential and senatorial elections, but the assumption of its sponsors appears to be that if and when the measure goes to the House of Representatives, members of that body will insert provisions for their own elections. Another section of the Senate bill would allow a tax credit of up to \$25 on private contributions to candidates, and this could increase the total cost to above \$100 million.

Several things are wrong about this. The possible cost to the Treasury is staggering,

especially so at a time when the budget deficit already is enormous and when the requirements of the war in Vietnam and the problems of the cities are urgent. The bill purports to encourage "honest elections" by relieving candidates of the need to solicit private contributions, yet it would permit candidates to solicit and receive such contributions if they did not choose to apply for Federal money. Such an optional arrangement is questionable; a uniform system would be better.

Moreover, the Senate bill bears a Democratic party label. It was opposed by all the Republican members of the Finance Committee, and will be resisted by the Senate Republican leadership when it comes up for debate. Legislation proposing major changes in our political system will be more effective if it has substantial support from both parties. The Senate bill conceivably could lead to a campaign in which all the Democratic candidates received their campaign money from the Treasury and all the Republicans received theirs from private contributors.

Earlier in the week the Senate passed a limited but sound bill to improve and standardize the reporting of campaign contributions and expenditures. It should be kept separate from the new bill for Federal payments, which should be examined carefully and at length.

#### LANGUAGE BARRIER IN EDUCATION GROWS IN NATION'S CAPITOL, WASHINGTON POST TAKES NOTE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Sunday Washington Post, of September 24, 1967, contained an article on education in Washington, D.C., a subject of great interest to those of us in Congress who have been working on a bill to provide for the setting up of systems of bilingual education. The article, "Latin Pupils Pose Problem," by Susan Jacoby, deals with that barrier to education which has only lately begun to receive the attention and concern which it should have.

A simple language barrier has been hampering the education of our large Spanish-speaking population in the Southwest for as long as this country has been in existence, and its solution has been found in that method which Miss Jacoby, writing for the Post, describes, that—

The students need to be taught English as a foreign language.

For only lately has the situation become a matter of vital concern, as the importance of education has become realized in the programs of combating poverty in the United States. At the same time it has been noted with concern by educators and legislators alike, that our school systems at present have few special measures for these students, simply putting them into an English-speaking system, to learn both language and subject matter as best they can.

As Miss Jacoby also points out, though, there is a certain difficulty encountered in the effective education of foreign-language students, and that is the need for funds. The hiring of qualified teachers is essential, and involves necessarily the training of those teachers. The system requires special attention and special equipment, and special administration. It certainly will require special funding. But it is, too, especially needed if the great and growing Spanish-de-

scended population of this country is to be adequately equipped to participate in our English-speaking society. For this reason, I have introduced S. 428, the bilingual American education bill, to provide for these special funds under the Elementary-Secondary Education Act.

I commend the Washington Post and writer Susan Jacoby on this concern over a problem whose dimensions are increasing in Washington, D.C., and throughout the country—the problem of the non-English-speaking student in our society and in our schools. More and more, we in America are becoming aware of the need for our society to insure the opportunity of advancement to all its members—for our Nation cannot progress unless all of its members progress. Attention to the barriers of language in education is a necessary step toward this opportunity, and this national progress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Latin Pupils Pose Problem," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### LATIN PUPILS POSE PROBLEM

(By Susan Jacoby)

Washington's public and parochial schools have a growing enrollment of Spanish-speaking students who do not understand English well enough to learn in their classes.

"In some cases, the children know so little English that they just can't get anything at all out of what is taught," says Sister Richardine, principal of Sacred Heart School at 1625 Park rd. nw.

Much of Washington's Spanish-speaking population is concentrated in the Upper Cardozo and Mount Pleasant areas. As many as 1000 students from Spanish-speaking homes may be enrolled in parochial and public schools that serve the area.

Some of the children cannot speak or understand any English beyond a simple "yes" or "no." Others have some command of conversational English but cannot read or write. Nearly all of the students need to be taught English as a foreign language by a Spanish-speaking teacher.

The schools are not providing any special help for Spanish-speaking children because they lack money to hire and train the language teachers they need. The money would have to come either from Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which serves both public and parochial schools, or from the regular budgets of the public and parochial school systems.

"Proposals to meet the needs of our children are being developed," says Winston E. Turner, principal of H. D. Cooke Elementary School. "But if you asked me what's being done for Spanish-speaking students now—outside of the regular program—I'd have to say nothing."

Cooke, 17th and Euclid Streets nw., has at least 125 students from Spanish-speaking homes. The Board of Education has approved a pilot project in which English will be taught as a foreign language to 80 children at the school.

"We hope to do this with teachers who are trained in methods appropriate to children," says Nadine Dutcher, a community coordinator for the Cardozo Area Model School Division. "Eventually we would like to train teachers in other schools in the area."

But the Board has not promised to finance the program out of school funds and the Model Schools may have to search for a private foundation grant.

Meanwhile, some public schools simply

place Spanish-speaking children in classes with much younger students, hoping that they will be able to understand something of what is being taught. Others place the children in "slow-moving" classes, but school officials admit that neither method helps break down the language barrier.

The parochial schools do not put Spanish-speaking students in classes with younger children because many parents object. A majority of the Spanish-speaking families, who come from predominantly Roman Catholic countries in South and Central America, enroll their children in parochial schools.

"We're working with the public schools in attempting to develop programs for these students," says Sister Richardine. "But really, we can't do anything without language teachers. We were refused Title I funds when we asked for them to hire a teacher this year."

Most school officials also feel that English classes for the children must be accompanied by instruction for their parents. The Board was asked at its Wednesday meeting to provide English classes for up to 1000 Spanish-speaking adults.

Carlos Rosario, chairman of a group called the Spanish-Speaking Committee, says that Washington has 50,000 Spanish-speaking residents. D. C. government agencies have no estimate.

The Americanization School, which provides English classes for all foreign-born residents over age 12, has been the only attempt by the D. C. government to cope with the problem. The school, located in Georgetown, has room for only about 650 students.

#### FUNDRAISING DINNER

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, recent press reports have recounted the activities of several Cabinet officers working to assure the success of a fundraising dinner being planned with the help of the Democratic National Committee to raise funds for Democratic Party activities and for the upcoming 1968 election campaign.

These reports, by inference and intimation, unfairly leave an impression that these activities might perhaps be improper, illicit, or otherwise malfeasant. To set the record straight I want to set forward the facts in the case and to place in proper perspective these vague charges that would make an act of dedication and citizenship by these public officials appear to be wrongdoing.

There is—and was—nothing wrong in the appearance of these officials at these preliminary events for the salute to the President scheduled for October 7 this year. The purpose of these small gatherings was to call together individuals with a known record of support for the President and his administration, to tell them about present programs and hopes for the future, and to call their attention to the gala dinner intended as a major fundraiser for the President's party.

The people invited to these small preliminary gatherings were selected from the many individuals known to the Democratic National Committee and to the cosponsors of the event: the President's Clubs around the country and the Citizens for Johnson-Humphrey organizations in every State of our land.

From among the many thousands of Americans whose demonstrated support is known to the officials of the Democratic Party, these individuals were selected because of the established fact that their past records of support might

permit them to contribute to the \$1,000-per-couple salute to the President.

One national committee official explained that the invitees to these events may have been doctors and lawyers, professional and management people, newspapermen, or even lobbyists. But all had records of past support for the administration.

Invitations to these early events were sent out before any speaker was located, again underscoring that special pressure was not the intent of the meeting. Once a luncheon was "booked" with a sufficient number of participants, top-ranking official spokesmen were located. Where more than one Cabinet officer was available, more than one came. Their appearance was a matter of their discretion, based on their calendar and their daily schedule.

There were three of these presalute cocktail parties. All were designed to achieve the same thing: to impress on a number of individuals capable of participating in the salute that their attendance would aid the party supporting the President in his programs.

At the first event Transportation Secretary Alan Boyd appeared to speak with eloquence and directness about the work of his new Department and its bright promise for the future. If skeptical businessmen and cynical executives can be inspired, that was the point of Secretary Boyd's appearance. And for anyone to impute baser motives to Mr. Boyd, whose whole career serves to deny such a charge, is itself an act of base inspiration.

The second luncheon enjoyed the participation of Secretary of Commerce Alexander Trowbridge and Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall. Able and attractive spokesmen for the President, they spoke forcefully of their programs, problems, and hopes. Again, the purpose of this second luncheon was to get across to the audience the dynamic and progressive outlook of this administration. There is not and cannot be anything clandestine or demeaning about the appearance of these administration officials for this purpose.

The third luncheon, still to take place, should find Secretary Udall and Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman teaming up to present their case for the administration. Both are loyal, ardent public servants who have suffered the barbs of critics who seek every opportunity to belittle their efforts and demean their dedication. If anything, that constant carping serves to motivate these two great public officials to rise to defend the administration's program whenever they can. They will do this at their presalute luncheon, and those privileged to hear them will surely respond in their own way with similar zeal.

What can be gained by attacking public servants for such activities? It is quite clear to me that the only gainers are those in the opposition party who would tie their hands and hamstring the programs of the Democratic Party.

We must all remember that the Democratic Party has always been the party of less wealth, fewer millionaires and countless more wage earners, fewer large contributors and many more small givers. This continues to be the case and



we are proud of that fact. The opposition party continues to outspend us approximately 4 to 1, and they would like to keep it that way.

We, for our part, will continue to encourage all those who agree with us to help us in our efforts.

And we will do that by providing inspiration for tomorrow rather than taking the course of the opposition party which is to rail at yesterday, attack today, and disparage tomorrow.

### WHO KILLED MY SON?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the war seems distant until it touches us personally. I can think of no more poignant expression of how the war touches a man personally than to read how a father feels on the death of his son in Vietnam. The insertion I make today is just that, a very touching letter by a man who lost his son in a distant war. But this letter is more than just touching. It says what it says with clarity and with dignity. The author, it might be noted, is a theological seminary professor, and his letter first appeared in the *Christian Century*.

I say no more, Mr. President, for the letter reprinted in the September 13 edition of the *Salem, Ind., Leader and Salem Democrat*, says it far more eloquently.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### HOME FROM VIETNAM: JUNE 14, 1967

(By M. Edward Clark, professor of religious education at Central Baptist Theological Seminary, Kansas City, Kans.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—It is common knowledge that the war in Viet Nam has aroused many dissenting viewpoints among the citizenry. While perhaps many, if not most, of our people lament the war—its horrible cost in men and money and its ambiguous purposes—the mood of frustration and despair grows. These radically different, and sometimes diametrically opposite viewpoints, about what should be done, seem powerless to change the course of events. Cutting through all this is the reaction of a parent to the death of a son. Readers will react differently to this father's statement and analysis, but his anguished cry, perhaps shared by thousands and even millions of our people, deserves attention—few will be untouched by it.)

On the night of June 14, 1967, I sat on the running board of a United Air Lines jeep waiting for the flight from San Francisco to come in. The arrival, scheduled for 11:13 p.m., was already a half-hour late.

As I waited I thought about my son, Tim. He was returning home from Vietnam on that flight. Little more than a month before, on May 2, I had waited at that same airport after Tim had said good-by and boarded a T.W.A. jet for San Francisco. That evening, at sundown, my wife and I, my daughter, my grandson, and Tim's girl of a few short days stood on the observation deck while his plane was delayed, first for late passengers and then for the landing of an incoming plane. Then the jet pushed its nose into the sky and dipped away toward the west, finally becoming a dark speck against the pale glow of the evening sky.

I

Now my son was coming home. The minutes dragged on. At last, shortly after mid-

night, a string of baggage carts came into sight and I knew that Tim had arrived. The jeep pulling the wagon train came to a stop at the freight office of United and a young man in uniform stepped out and shook hands first with the undertaker and then with me. "I am Lieutenant Campbell," he said. "I have been assigned as an escort for your son. May I extend my sympathy."

My son was in an oblong gray plywood box with two bronze handles on either side. Stenciled across one end of the box were the words Pfc. Timothy R. Clark US55881629. On the top of the box at one end was the word head, and on the upper corner of one side were the words Flag Inside.

So now my son was home. Home from the scraggy brush-covered hill where, the Thursday before, he had written us a letter, his last letter. He had said that in his idle moments of waiting he let his mind roam the streets of Kansas City, visualizing each corner, each building, the lights at night; the memory took away some of the loneliness of Vietnam. The next day at 2300 hours (11:00 p.m.) Tim took the brunt of a hand grenade thrown by a "hostile" soldier. Up to the time he wrote his last letter, Tim had not seen a hostile soldier, neither a Vietcong or a North Vietnamese. But he had seen some of the results of their activity. A couple of weeks before, while his battalion was out on perimeter defense, the bunker that was serving as their headquarters had been mortared and machine gunned, and six of his buddies had been killed and eight wounded. Later, he heard, one of the wounded had died.

The probability is that Tim never did see a Vietcong or a North Vietnamese soldier. If so, at least one of his wishes was fulfilled, for in several of his letters he expressed the hope that he would never see any of the "enemy."

So now his last flight had touched down, and he was home never to fly again, never to sing or sigh again, never to wish or hope again; his only task now to wait out the long slow hours of eternity, where the hatreds of men cannot enter.

The freight clerk opened the freighthouse door and the baggage cart was backed up to the waiting hearse. The four of us—the escort, the undertaker, the freight man and I—shoved the gray box from the cart into the hearse. This done the escort said: "Mr. Clark, the army has declared your son to be nonviewable. If you would like we, the undertaker and I, can open the casket in the morning and see if he can be made viewable, but we don't know." I answered that the viewability of the body was not important, and that we did not plan on an open casket during the funeral ceremonies.

With that the three of us got into the hearse and began the drive to the funeral home. On the way to the airfield I had expressed to the funeral director the wish that after we had picked up the body we might take a sentimental journey and drive down the streets Tim had seen in his mind's eye so shortly before the grenade found him.

So as we crossed the Broadway bridge the undertaker steered the car south into Main street, past the theaters, the bars, the stores, down to Fourteenth street, where we turned left to Grand, then north on Grand past the Midland Camera store where Tim had bought some of his camera equipment, past the bus station where, just a year ago, he had arrived one midnight from Fort Leonard Wood on his first weekend pass. Then across the viaduct and on to the intercity expressway to Kansas City, Kansas, and the funeral home.

All that was four days ago. The last of the ceremonies is over. Relatives who arrived before the body of my son will leave in the morning. Only a small plot of broken sod and a few wilted flowers mark the spot where one who once dreamed dreams great and small, one who dared to walk the earth as a friend to all men, who scorned the ordinary and fought desperately within himself to be

what every man ought to be: a unique human being—only the broken sod and the fading flowers mark the spot where one, once so full of hope, now lies distorted and non-viewable.

II

#### Who killed my son?

The telegram sent by the army said he was killed by a detonated grenade thrown by hostile forces—by the communists or the North Vietnamese or the Vietcong. There is at least a half-truth here, but, alas, only a half-truth. A hostile force was, to be sure, the immediate cause of his death. But that fact is really but the final detail. The ultimate cause of the death of Timothy R. Clark, of the other 175 who were killed that week, of the more than 11,000 Americans who thus far have lost their lives in Vietnam and of the many who are yet to die—the cause of all these tragic deaths ultimately can be traced to three things: Pride, Greed and Indifference.

Why do the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese fight so stubbornly against the most powerful nation in the world? Because to admit defeat would be to surrender all pride, pride which long ago the French took from them and which they finally retrieved by defeating the French at Dien Bien Phu.

Why does the American high command sacrifice life after life when admittedly the land it holds is beside the point? Again the answer is pride—the pride of a proud man who has the support not only of other proud men but of greedy men as well. For is it not true that there is much more room for promotion and advancement when a war is on than when peace prevails? Perhaps they are not conscious of pride and greed; they can always be rationalized as patriotism. But they are pride and greed nonetheless. And will anyone pretend that there is no greed in the companies that fight for the war contracts?

What of indifference? Since World War II conscription—something many of our ancestors came to America to escape—has become the accepted thing. So indifferent are we that hardly a murmur is raised when the Congress proposes a law that will draft 19-year-olds as first choice; for 19-year-olds make better soldiers! Do they indeed? Or is it rather that 19-year-olds can more easily be led to believe what the army wants them to believe? Is it that they will go simply because they are told to go? Escort Campbell told me that the only reasons he had for being in Vietnam was "orders."

III

The fact is, as a recent editorial in the *Boston Globe* indicates, that the industrial-military-scientific-political complex finds this war a convenient way of satisfying its selfish purposes. The casualty lists are getting a bit longer now, but they have not yet reached the danger point. A few more waves of the flag will keep the war going at least for a while yet.

Besides, most of the casualties are high school or college dropouts and their parents aren't apt to be in positions of power. The wealthy and the prestigious can keep their sons in school (the proposed new law makes it even easier) until the danger of the draft is over. Hopefully there will be plenty of 19-year-olds so that those who are older will not be called. Indifference and the cultic religion of Americanism will take care of most of the problems.

Who then killed my son? The Vietcong? The North Vietnamese? No, not they alone. I killed him. You killed him. False and greedy patriots killed him. Proud and ambitious politicians killed him. The armed forces of his own nation killed him. The guilt of his death is upon us all. His blood and the blood of 11,000 is on our heads. Each new day brings more oblong gray boxes to rest on our doorstep.

But the madness continues. Last week 176

Americans were killed, and who knows how many Vietnamese, South and North, soldier or civilian. This week there will be more. And each week the slaughter continues, pride and greed increase and we edge nearer to the point of no return, a nuclear holocaust that will devastate the earth and make us all nonviewable.

Madness, madness, madness!

#### CENSORSHIP OF THE PRESS IS STILL FLAGRANT IN SAIGON: IS IT FOR THIS AMERICAN BOYS ARE DYING?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, despite the provisions of the new South Vietnamese Constitution supposedly guaranteeing a free press, the military junta in charge of the South Vietnamese Government continues to disregard those provisions and to suspend newspapers writing in opposition to its policies.

This morning's New York Times reports the suspension of the newspaper Thoi Dai in Saigon merely because it published a report that one of the committees of the Constituent Assembly was about to recommend the invalidation of the September 3 election.

By coincidence, that newspaper is reported to have "followed a generally anti-Government line."

By another coincidence, the newspaper also supported Tran Van Huong, a peace candidate in the September 3 election who finished fourth.

Nothing has changed in South Vietnam since the elections. The repression of civil liberties continues.

I ask unanimous consent that a news item from Saigon published in the New York Times this morning be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SAIGON GOVERNMENT SUSPENDS A PAPER

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, September 26.—The Government suspended indefinitely today the newspaper Thoi Dai. It was the fourth Vietnamese language newspaper suspended this month although the new constitution forbids all forms of press censorship.

The proximate cause of Thoi Dai's suspension, informed sources said, was an article it published yesterday. The article reported that a special committee of the Constituent Assembly studying the national elections on Sept. 3 had decided to recommend the invalidation of the balloting.

Nguyen Thanh Vinh, the committee chairman, denied today that any such decision had been reached. He said the committee's report would be turned in according to schedule on Thursday. He added that no vote had yet been taken. The Assembly must decide by Monday whether to validate or reject the election results. It is expected to approve them.

Thoi Dai has followed a generally anti-Government line. It supported Tran Van Huong, who finished fourth in the presidential race.

#### JUST SHIFTING THE DEFICIT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the imposition of a surtax now would be a mere shifting of a part of the budget deficit from the public to the private sector. I maintain that the private sector should

not be asked to shoulder this greater tax burden.

Mr. George Pulay, city editor of the London Times, has written an incisive article concerning the 10-percent surtax proposal. Mr. Pulay points out that Mr. Pierre Rinfret, the noted business economist, is one of those who have grave misgivings about the tax increase and notes that President Johnson's primary expert authority for the successful tax cut of 1964 was Pierre Rinfret. He was a prophet then, and it is my belief that he is still a farsighted economic analyst. I am sure that in time those other economists who also view the administration's tax message as both ill conceived and ill timed will prove more prophetic than those granting unqualified support to this fiscal proposal of very dubious wisdom.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Pulay's article of August 8 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE TROUBLE FACING U.S. TAX LEVY

(By George Pulay)

The Congressional battle over President Johnson's proposed 10 per cent tax surcharge is likely to be a bitter affair. Although the proposal was received initially with surprising calm, opposition to it is mounting steadily, not least because it is felt that some of the statistical evidence produced in support of the tax increase is suspect.

Contrary to some recent public statements, the effective personal tax rate in the United States is today higher than at any time since the last world war. The 1964 income tax cut has been wiped out by the increase in the tax rate as a result of progressive taxes and by substantial rises in social security taxes. In fact personal contributions for social insurance have just about doubled in the past five years to more than \$20,000m.

But concern over the tax increase goes much further. Some people see in it a threat to the economy in a year in which many indicators are at best uncertain and in which growth will be limited to around 2 per cent.

One business economist holding strong views on this question is Pierre Rinfret, whose Rinfret-Boston Associates have among their clients General Electric, R.C.A., White Weld, and Chemical Bank. He disagrees strongly with the current tax theory which is basically that the \$20,000m. federal cash deficit is excessive and that its refinancing will be highly inflationary. And that raising taxes at the personal and corporate levels will take money from the private sector and lower the federal deficit.

Rinfret feels that as the private sector is also running a deficit—of the order of \$26,000m. in the past two years—a rise in corporate tax rates simply shifts the deficit from the Government to private industry. It neither increases nor decreases the deficit so far as Government and business are concerned. With companies unlikely to be willing to cut back on either plant and equipment or on inventories, they would have to satisfy their demand for funds in the open market.

This would lead to a rise in corporate issues and would mean a shift in demand for funds from a borrower who pays lower interest rates, that is the Government, to borrowers paying higher interest rates, that is private industry. Thus a rise in corporate taxes would either depress the corporate demand, which would lead to federal revenues being less than estimated, or it would result in increased monetary pressures.

On the consumer side, a strong case against the tax increase can also be made. United

States industry is now working at just below 85 per cent capacity (as in 1962) with steel and car production pointing down. The proposed tax surcharge applies to incomes of above \$5,000 only, leaving out about 35 per cent of all taxpayers.

Taking the average United States credit indebtedness of \$1,800, repayment over three years represents about 16 per cent of average income of \$6,000. The higher tax could cut severely the individual ability to repay loans.

If there are inflationary threats, the anti-surcharge lobby argues, they are in the service sector, not in manufacturing. United States growth in volume this year is put at 2 per cent, and in value at 2½ per cent. For 1968 the estimates are 4 per cent growth in volume and 6½ per cent in value. Of America's 70 million labour force working an average of just over 40 hours a week, some 24 million are working more than 60 hours.

In political terms, the raising of taxes just before election year is a brave step. But it is very doubtful whether the President will get his 10 per cent surcharge. A compromise looks likely. He may also be forced to postpone its introduction until January 1 and this would need even greater political courage.

#### "VIETNAM: ITS EFFECT ON THE NATION"—AN OUTSTANDING BANKER'S VIEW ON OUR VIETNAM FOLLY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, some 400 executives taking part in a movement called Business Executives' Movement for Vietnam Peace met today in Washington and listened to a memorable address by Marriner S. Eccles entitled "Vietnam—Its Effect on the Nation."

It is scarcely necessary to identify this outstanding American, director of many important business enterprises, president and owner of banks in Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming, former Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and a preeminent national figure in the world of finance.

This is an address that should be widely circulated. It is not difficult for me to approve much of what Mr. Eccles said because I have been saying some of these things about our Vietnam involvement for the last 3½ years. Mr. Eccles summed up, what he amplified at length, that:

The most important issue before the country today is our involvement in Vietnam. It affects every facet of our lives and our relationship to the rest of the world. Are the sacrifices imposed justified by the stakes of war?

He answers that question by saying that those sacrifices are not justified. He calls for, as I have, a confession of error for getting in, and urges that we get out.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The visit to this country of Soviet Premier Kosygin has given us all cause to think seriously about the Soviet Union, our relationship to it, and the relationship of both of us to the greater and more compelling world problems. Upon the solution of these problems hangs the survival of both the United States and Russia, and perhaps the world. As Senator Fulbright so aptly stated: "America is showing signs of that arrogance of power which has afflicted, weakened, and in some cases destroyed great nations in the past." Never before has there been such valid



reason for the fears that best us. Never before has there been reason to feel that the human race was speeding along the road to possible oblivion.

The most important issue before the country today is our involvement in Vietnam. It affects every facet of our lives and our relationship to the rest of the world. Are the sacrifices imposed justified by the stakes of war? What are the reasons and justification, if any, for our involvement in Vietnam?

For the past twenty years our government has believed that communism intends to conquer the world—by force, if persuasion does not succeed—and that it is the duty of the United States to save the world from that fate. The American picture of aggressive communism is unreal.

The President believes that aggressive, monolithic groups are making war in South Vietnam. Under the Truman Doctrine of containment, communism has continued to spread. It has advanced through revolutions rather than by military aggression. But while communism has been advancing, the power of Russia over the communist world has been waning. It is evident that communism is not a monolithic world power. Russia has its differences with the Yugoslavs. The Chinese and Russians have conflicts of national interest which override communism. The threat of a united communist world does not exist. National rivalries divide the communist states as well as democracies.

It is apparent that communist countries are as intensely nationalist as others. They crave independence and resent interference. They will fight against domination by foreigners—whether they be capitalist or communist.

The Johnson Administration believes that the war in Vietnam is being made solely by communist intervention from without. This does not explain the tenacity of the Viet Cong. They are not Russians, Chinese or North Vietnamese communists; they are South Vietnamese. They are fighting for national liberation and the unity of South Vietnam, the causes for which others, including Americans, have fought.

The Administration sees every rebellion as the result of a deep plot out of Moscow or Peking, when it usually is the result of crushing poverty, hunger and intolerable living conditions. The aim of revolution, no matter what its ideology, is to achieve self-determination, economic security, racial equality and freedom. Let us not forget that while our road was not via communism, we did, as a nation, emerge from revolution.

We might as well face it: there may be more communist countries in the world. But we need not panic at this. Communist nations vary widely; each has a different version of communist theory to fit its own problems. The more of these countries there are, the greater their diversity.

Communism is only part of a broad movement: the rising of desperate people in Asia, Africa and Latin America. We crush insurrection in one place, only to find a revolution—whether communist, socialist or nationalist—springing up somewhere else. With military bases around the world and ships in every ocean, a revolution takes place in Cuba, 90 miles off our shore.

How can we reconcile what we are doing to the South Vietnamese under the guise of saving them from communism? We have destroyed vast areas of their country. We have killed, wounded or burned hundreds of thousands of children, as well as countless parents, brothers, husbands and sons. The family has been smashed. We can only guess at the terrible long-range social effects that will result from our actions. No wonder the great majority of the people do not consider us their savior, but hate us and want us to get out of their country.

Despite this, the United States military has increasingly taken over the war. In 1965 one American was killed for eight South

Vietnamese; in 1966, one for two; and to date in 1967, one for one, U.S. casualties through 1966 were over 6,000 killed and almost 38,000 wounded. Projected for 1967 alone, based on actual figures for the first six months: 11,190 killed; 64,264 wounded, making a projected total to the end of this year of 19,344 killed and 102,002 wounded. We have lost 832 planes as well as hundreds of helicopters.

Based on the following reports by Secretary of Defense McNamara, it is apparent that we are making little progress after three years of fighting and cannot win a decisive victory:

In 1964, "McNamara told Congress that the U.S. hopes to withdraw most of its troops from Vietnam before the end of 1965."

In 1965, he said, "It will be a long war."

In October, 1966, he said, "I see no reason to expect any significant increase in the level of the tempo of operations in South Vietnam."

Communist strength in South Vietnam has increased from 120,000 in January 1965, to an estimated 298,000 at present. However, North Vietnam has committed only one-fifth of its regular army. Based on the estimate that guerrillas must be outnumbered four to one, the communists have more than matched the American buildup to 476,000 now. It is no wonder that General Westmoreland claims he needs five additional U.S. divisions: more than 200,000 men.

General Thieu recently said: "We have not enough Allied soldiers which we need to win the war. We need a big amount of troops to be everywhere, to do many jobs at the same time." At this time the President might reconsider his September 1964, statement: "We don't want our American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys. We don't want to get involved . . . and get tied down in a land war in Asia."

During the past two years Russia has added to the enemy arsenal in South Vietnam rockets, artillery, heavy mortars, automatic infantry weapons and flame throwers, while in North Vietnam it has supplied fighter planes and anti-aircraft guns. The Russians are reported to be supplying 75 per cent of all military supplies and have said they will continue to furnish all military aid necessary. The Chinese are furnishing part of the small arms, clothing and food, and have said they will assist North Vietnam with troops whenever requested to do so. Both countries have indicated they would enter the war, if necessary, to keep the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong from being defeated. It is quite apparent that neither Russia or China are willing for the United States to achieve a victory over the communists and to establish a powerful military base on the mainland of Asia.

If Russia were conducting daily bombing raids against an American ally, as we are doing against a Russian ally, it is inconceivable that we would limit ourselves to providing only military equipment, as they are doing.

What is the effect of our policy on the nation? The Vietnam War is responsible for the most serious economic, financial and political problems in this country. It is responsible for the huge federal deficit which, without a tax increase, could run to more than \$25 billion. In order to curb the resulting inflationary pressures the government has proposed a 10 per cent surtax on individuals and corporations, which, if enacted, would reduce the deficit, on an annual basis, between \$9 and \$10 billion.

The war is directly causing a substantial increase in the deficiency in our international balance of payments, which is already serious, as we are by far the world's largest short-term debtor, now owing nearly \$26 billion. It is reducing our free gold to meet these obligations to less than \$2 billion.

Also, the war is creating inflationary pressures in nearly every field—increased costs of living, going up at about 3 per cent per

year—a great shortage of skilled workers—increasing strikes and exorbitant demands by union labor—and higher interest rates, in all categories, due to the heavy demand for credit.

The costs of war do not end with the cessation of hostilities. Excluding the Vietnam War, at the end of 1965 we had approximately 20,600,000 veterans. Total veterans' benefits paid to the end of 1965 were \$134 billion; by the end of this year it is estimated they will be \$147 billion. In 1966 we were spending in excess of \$6 billion per year for veterans' benefits, and the Korean War alone is costing more than \$700 million a year. The annual operating expense of the Veterans' Administration hospitals has now passed the billion dollar mark. In addition, during 1965 the land and construction costs of medical facilities was \$1.4 billion. Veterans costs will grow rapidly as long as the war lasts, and will continue for decades. The ultimate astronomical expense is difficult to conceive. In the financial sense, a war is never over.

But the real tragedy is not financial; it is the useless suffering of the millions of our people whose sons, husbands and brothers are drawn into this useless conflict unwillingly and are killed and maimed for life—not in defense of their country—but because of our incompetent and ill-advised leadership.

I believe Russia is glad to see us bogged down in Vietnam, diverting multi-billions of our resources and millions of our manpower, while it is rapidly gaining in the nuclear arms race. While the U.S. lags in its nuclear defense, the Soviet Union is rushing ahead. There are some who believe today's nuclear balance has already shifted to Russia.

At a time when defense against missile attack is still in the talking stage in this country, the Soviet Union is racing ahead with unprecedented speed.

Of even greater concern to us at this time is China's rapid growth in the development of nuclear weapons. It is now estimated that between 1972 and 1975 China will be a first-class nuclear power with a full arsenal of H-bombs. The Chinese ICBM will be in production, with an intercontinental range of 6,000 miles. This would make it possible for the Chinese to hit most of the world; the northern stretches of the U.S., Los Angeles, San Francisco, Chicago and Detroit would be particularly vulnerable. Meanwhile, we are spending over \$2 billion a month on Vietnam instead of preparing to deter the rapidly atomic strength of Russia and China.

Our foreign aid since World War II has totaled \$128 billion—\$91 billion in economic aid and \$37 billion in military aid—with dubious results in many instances. The United States is pledged to defend 43 countries under specific treaties and agreements. In addition, a commitment to stop aggression covers all the countries in the Middle East, and any country where the U.S. has a military base is promised support.

While we've been spending tens of billions abroad, our cities are exploding in violent protest as a result of our injustice, neglect, and failure to meet the promises of the "Great Society." Our total estimated Vietnam and foreign aid budget this year is \$30 billion; whereas, the Great Society budget is approximately 40 per cent of that amount—\$12.5 billion—which is half of what we spent in Vietnam alone.

Senator Charles Percy says: "If we continue to spend \$66 million a day trying to save the 16 million people of South Vietnam while leaving the plight of 20 million urban poor in our own country unresolved—then I think we have our priorities terribly confused."

Public and Congressional reaction to our world-wide involvement, especially in Vietnam, is forcing the Administration to reconsider its role as world policeman.

The Vietnam debacle, tragic as it is, may yet be a blessing in disguise if it forces us to recognize our staggering failures at home. Runaway crime, delinquency, riots in our

cities, loss of respect for law and order, and the rebellion of frustrated youth—all spring in part from this. No wonder Russia had this to say about the U.S.: "Only in mockery can the word 'free' be applied to a society which cannot provide tolerable living conditions and democratic rights to a considerable part of its population."

It is pathetic that the most powerful country in the world, with 6 per cent of its population and producing 40 per cent of its wealth, should have lost the respect of most of the world. The world, with few exceptions, would like us to leave Vietnam. The continued confidence of Japan, our greatest asset in Asia, is dependent upon our getting out of Vietnam. The same is true with all Western European governments and our friends in Latin America. We cannot survive, no matter how powerful we are, in a world without friends.

With the war having these disastrous effects on the nation, it is madness to continue our ruthless pursuit in Vietnam. To withdraw is sanity. The consequences of withdrawal cannot possibly be as disastrous for this nation as pursuing our present course. The greatest service we could render the Vietnamese is to withdraw from their country, leaving them to negotiate a conclusion to the war, which is their right.

There is something intrinsically wrong with the idea that the United States should participate in negotiations to decide the future of Vietnam. We are an outside power, which is true also of China and the Soviet Union. To have the future of Vietnam decided by outside powers is a violation of self-determination. Whatever negotiations go on should be among the Vietnamese themselves—each group negotiating from its own position of strength, uninfluenced by outside powers.

If the U.S. insists on negotiating, it should be with Russia and China, as the sinews of war are being furnished by these countries. Without these supplies the war would collapse. In any case, the United States cannot through negotiations create strength for any segment of a future government in South Vietnam. The presence of the United States can only distort the true balance of forces, and only a settlement representing this balance can bring about a stable government.

No one seems to be able to show in what way a communist Vietnam would be bad. Under Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam would be quite as likely to maintain its independence as has Tito in Yugoslavia. Ho Chi Minh is unquestionably the choice of the Vietnamese people, both North and South. Both Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower have stated that Ho Chi Minh was so popular he would win an election in Vietnam. While Ho is a communist, he is not Russian, he is not Chinese, he is Vietnamese—and Russian, Chinese and Vietnamese communism may differ widely. It is even possible that our best interests would be served by having Ho Chi Minh's communist regime as a buffer against the Chinese communists.

History does not show that a nation that liquidates a bad venture suffers from loss of prestige. Proud, powerful England surrendered to the thirteen American colonies and did not suffer for it. More recently, France moved out voluntarily from Algeria and Indochina. Today France has more world prestige than ever before. Russia pulled its missiles out of Cuba; its prestige has not suffered.

Hans Morgenthau has written: "Is it really a boon to the prestige of the most powerful nation on earth to be bogged down in a war which it is neither able to win nor can afford to lose? This is the real issue which is presented by the argument of prestige." We should be less interested in saving face and more interested in saving lives. It is not easy for a proud nation to admit it has blundered, but throughout history great men and nations have gained stature by so doing.

Getting out of Vietnam will enable us to

re-establish a friendly relationship with Russia and thereby bring about a balance of power in the world, which would tend to deter any aggressive policy on the part of China. So long as we are in Vietnam, Russia and China consider us their enemy. Kossygin made this crystal clear in his statement before the United Nations and in his conference with Johnson at Glassboro.

We should also recognize China diplomatically, open our doors to Chinese trade and travel, and help bring China into the United Nations. We should no longer ignore one-fourth of the world's population as though it did not exist.

In conclusion: What can we expect from the stricken Vietnamese nation but hatred, deep and abiding? Their farms and villages have been laid waste, their families scattered to the winds. Their husbands and sons are dead, maimed or missing. And children, orphaned and grotesquely burned, have been seen running through the rubble in packs.

We can never blot out the deed which stands as a testimony of man's inhumanity to man. Nor can we really make amends for the enormity of our crime against these people, who know us not, but whom we have chosen to save from communism.

But we can try. We can make a beginning. And, in conscience, how can that beginning be less than immediate withdrawal of our evil presence, because that is what it has proved to be in the lives of the Vietnamese. And we can humbly, with vigor, and never ceasing, do everything in the power of a rich and repentant nation to heal, and rebuild, and reassure.

The Vietnamese will never forget us, and it is to be hoped that we will never forget the Vietnamese. Because it is this Vietnam tragedy which has shown us ourselves as others see us: a nation to be feared instead of loved, flushed with pride and sure of omnipotence. An arrogant nation, not qualified to handle power wisely.

While the hour is late, it is not yet impossible to turn the page. Men and nations have made new beginnings before. And out of defeat, there has often come victory—and what a victory it could be for this nation, so bountifully endowed—to reverse its image, make itself loved and admired and revered, so that it could stand forth before the emerging peoples around the globe, as an example of what they might wish to become.

But the road is long—and we must win much forgiveness. So let us begin.

#### A MORALLY UNTENABLE COURSE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the debate about American involvement in Vietnam is escalating. It appears to me that even though there is much more being said in the debate, the conclusions being offered are fewer.

In fact, the conclusions are being narrowed to these: "If the administration refuses to win the war, it's time to get out." This plainly put "either-or" is the conclusion of an editorial published in the News-Sentinel, a daily newspaper in Fort Wayne, Ind. It is important to note that the argument used for this conclusion is that America's present course is morally untenable.

Because the editorial states what I believe many Americans are thinking and saying, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### A MORALLY UNTENABLE COURSE

"It was the best of times. It was the worst of times."

This Dickensian opening to "A Tale of

Two Cities" set the scene for his powerful novel involving the French Revolution. Its sentiments are particularly apt for us today.

For the United States this is, indeed, the best of times and the worst of times. Never have so many had it so good. Statistically, we have record income, record employment, record production, materially, we seemingly have it made.

But there is a deep, underlying disquiet in the United States today. We are a nation divided on our course in Vietnam. We are a nation aghast at the civil turmoil in the streets of many of our major cities. We are a nation unsettled by our seeming inability to come to grips with the problems of our Negro minority.

And there is a growing inclination among thoughtful men to tie Vietnam abroad and civil unrest at home together. While we are not at all sure they should be, we can understand the feeling that our domestic problems far overshadow our commitments to the government of South Vietnam.

Our own editorial stand on the Vietnam War can be summed up simply:

The News-Sentinel opposed our involvement in Vietnam to begin with. We contended that a handful of "observers" would soon be parlayed into a full force. We agreed with the late General Douglas MacArthur that American involvement in an Asiatic land war would be suicidal.

As the war was escalated, and "observers" became American soldiers locked in what Secretary of State Dean Rusk called a "dirty, untidy disagreeable war," The News-Sentinel urged that we either win the war or get out. We insisted the apparent lack of a viable plan to prosecute the war by the Johnson Administration was turning Vietnam into a massive meatgrinder, with attrition of American manpower and dollars the only prognosis. But we were hopeful that the Administration could shape up some sort of a viable, peaceful solution to the "dirty" business.

We have now lost that hope.

A few days ago, The News-Sentinel carried a story reflecting the latest casualty figures in Vietnam. Last week, 108 U.S. servicemen were killed in Vietnam. Another 883 were wounded. It was about an average week.

The casualties brought the total of U.S. dead in Vietnam to 12,605. In addition, a total of 77,153 servicemen have been wounded; 708 are missing. Total casualties in the Vietnam War to date now stand at 90,826 American servicemen.

The Johnson Administration apparently is content to continue the war at the cost of about 100 American lives a week and some 800 other servicemen being wounded. The Johnson Administration is apparently willing to spend more than \$20 billion annually to prosecute a war in which our fortunes are worse today than they were several years ago.

There is a disposition on the part of the Administration to ignore the advice of many recognized experts on the kind of warfare being fought in Vietnam. It refuses to establish blockades on land and sea aimed at cutting off supplies to the enemy—much of it carried in the vessels of our so-called allies. As a result, the prospect of the contending forces sitting down at a peace table over Vietnam seems more remote than ever.

The News-Sentinel feels the Johnson Administration's present conduct of the war is morally untenable and fiscally suicidal.

If the Administration refuses to win the war, it's time to get out!

#### FOUR-HUNDRED-MILE HIKE TO ENLIST IN U.S. MARINES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in today's press there was published a picture of a young West Virginia who has just completed a 400-



mile hike to Camp Lejeune, at Jacksonville, N.C.

The young man, Julius C. Foster, 28, of Welch, made the hike to demonstrate that not all Americans are draft card burners or the like.

On his arrival at camp, Foster, a Marine Corps reservist who recently graduated from West Virginia University, asked to enlist and was immediately sworn in.

While I do not advocate that every young American male walk 400 miles to report for enlistment, I do believe that Foster's gesture is symbolic of the patriotism of this Nation. It speaks for the overwhelming majority of decent, law-abiding, industrious Americans who realize that laws are not made to be mocked and that civic and patriotic duty is not a thing of the past.

I commend this young man for his gesture and wish him well during his tour of duty with the Marines.

### IMPROVING WATER AND RAIL TRANSPORT COORDINATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the leadership of the University of Indiana in developing forward thinking on the problems of the economy is well illustrated again by a study session on transportation held September 6 at Bloomington under the direction of Dr. L. L. Waters, professor of transportation. Some fresh and original ideas on how substantial savings in transportation costs may be achieved through better coordination between railroad and water services were advanced by W. J. Barta, president of the Mississippi Valley Barge Line Co. Our universities are increasingly becoming seedbeds for new ideas for industry and agriculture and it is gratifying that the University of Indiana is in the forefront of this trend which is so vital to the development of our economy. I wish to share Mr. Barta's remarks with the Senate; therefore I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS BETTER WATER-RAIL COORDINATION POSSIBLE?—A PRAGMATIC NEW LOOK AT WATER-RAIL COORDINATION PROBLEMS

(Remarks of W. J. Barta, president, Mississippi Valley Barge Line Co., American Society of Traffic and Transportation, University of Indiana, Bloomington, Ind., Sept. 6, 1967)

My topic today is the somewhat ponderous one of "Fitting Water Transport into Sophisticated Distribution Systems." The title suggests something very complicated and difficult. In actual fact, my subject is a simple one.

In a rapidly expanding economy, the demand for freight transportation services is expected to double by 1980. Responding to this expanding demand will require heavy new investment from the privately owned transportation companies of all modes. Some estimates put the amount to be spent on new and improved transportation equipment in the next five years alone at \$27 billion dollars.

The magnitude of the investment outlays needed and the rapidly expanding demand dictate the need for a new examination of the old question: Are the nation's transport

resources being used with optimum efficiency? The answer is almost certainly: no. Students of the subject believe that a major breakdown in efficiency results from the failure of the different modes to fit their services together as a single system in which the traffic is permitted to move by the most efficient routing, cost and service factors considered.

For as long as I can remember, the transportation experts have been dissatisfied with the ability of the transportation industry to fit together the cost and service advantages of the different modes. Imagine a computer equipped with critical information as to the service characteristics and true comparative efficiency of the different modes and capable of making impartial recommendations as to the routing of traffic. It is the opinion of the experts that if routing decisions were made objectively, the traffic pattern would be very different and the nation's freight bill much less. They have been particularly concerned that the potential economies of water and rail coordination have been under-utilized.

The nation's rivers are strategically located to supplement the rail networks on major movements of coal, grain, fertilizers, steel, chemicals, metallic and non-metallic ores, petroleum products and a long list of other basic commodities which move in quantities of millions of tons. The east-west main line of the Ohio River system connects with the main north-south line of the Mississippi River. Including the Missouri River, the low cost water highway extends almost from the Canadian border to the Gulf and from the Appalachian mountains to the Rockies to provide an economical adjunct to rail service for the mid-America region. Great Lakes, coastwise and intercoastal services and other river and canal systems provide equally strategically located supplements to the efficient overland rail network.

In an economy in which rising costs of materials and wages are becoming a matter of increasing concern, intensive utilization of low cost water transportation provides a major opportunity to achieve substantial savings in production and distribution costs for both industry and agriculture.

The simple fact is that freight can be transported by water at a fifth to a half of the cost of transporting it overland. Fitting this capability into the distribution pattern is an important objective of any cost-conscious traffic manager.

The opening up of new water-rail routes could save the economy millions of dollars in transport costs. This in turn would benefit consumers through lower prices, contribute to slowing inflation and improve the nation's ability to compete in foreign markets.

Apart from these considerations, there is a growing concern with the continued effectiveness of healthy competition in stimulating new investment in improved transport services. As the super-railroads are formed from the mergers, shippers are increasingly finding competition diminished. A water-rail route equal to or greater in efficiency than the all-rail route can often supply that practical competitive alternative so necessary to healthy progress.

Much more intensive use of ocean, Great Lakes and river highways for domestic commerce in combination with rail is, I believe, an idea whose time has come.

I do not mention water-truck coordination simply because this is now so good that there is little room for improvement. Wherever water service requires the supplement of truck service, the connection is readily available. The truck lines and the water carriers work in friendly harmony in developing new traffic and improving the service.

But rail-water coordination is dominated by out-moded tradition, unfriendliness in business relationships and a vast ignorance

of capabilities of combined rail and water service.

The barriers standing in the way of opening up new water-rail routings seem to most observers to be largely artificial. William H. Tucker, Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, said last month: "I suggest that each of the various carrier modes suffers from a severe case of channel-mindedness, continually fortifying their modal fences, boundaries and prerogatives." As you know, the Commission is proposing new legislation for through route and joint rate authority. But Mr. Tucker recognizes that—and I quote again—"the real impetus for this change should have come from the transportation industry itself."

It is never too late to try the voluntary route. We can perhaps take heart from the fact that in the early days of regulation, the same channel-mindedness dominated relations between railroads. The railroads were once just as hostile to each other as they have recently been to the water carriers. The most difficult single problem seemed to have been the lack of friendly businesslike relationships.

Two paragraphs from the ICC's Annual Report for 1888 tell the story. They could have been written to describe the intermodal climate in 1967.

"An impartial observer is compelled to say that the methods so frequently resorted to for the remedy of supposed grievances or for the punishment of supposed wrongs are methods which do not belong to the present age . . . To make the adversary feel and fear the power to inflict injury is often the first and principal thought, and a rate is cut when in a ruder age it would have been a throat."

And again:

"But the evils arising from the want of a friendly business relationship between the railroads fall largely upon the public also . . . The difference between performing the legal duty grudgingly, though to the letter of the bond, or on the other hand performing it in an accommodating spirit and with the purpose to make the service as valuable as possible, may in some cases be the difference between a general annoyance and a great public convenience. A short road may sometimes make itself little better than a public nuisance by simply abstaining from all accommodation that could not by law be forced from it."

A recent Department of Commerce study of intermodal coordination directed by Professor Merrill J. Roberts of the University of Pittsburgh suggests that some railroads today may well be making a "public nuisance" of themselves in this context. The study notes, and I quote: "Railroads have been markedly reluctant to cooperate with barge lines in establishing coordinated services."

But as well as stating the problem, the study may also have provided the clue to the answer. Elsewhere the study notes this important fact: "The railroads' traditional orientation has been to output and sales. Recently, however, they have been forced in the direction of profit orientation by competitive pressures."

Perhaps the brightest prospect for better coordination may well be the old and reliable profit motive. It has been traditional thinking among railroads that a rail-water connection is somehow bad for the railroad. On significant movements of coal, fertilizers, grain and phosphates, some movements have recently been developed which yield particular railroads new and profitable traffic. Under such circumstances, there is an opportunity to overcome traditional reluctance. The water carrier, however, often has difficulty getting a hearing in the first place.

An effective barrier to a more efficient rail-water movement which results in substantial savings to the customer is sometimes the regional rate bureau. A proposed rate, profitable to the proposing railroad, may be seen

by another member of the rate bureau as a threat to a "rate structure." The affected railroad will make sure the rate proposal is voted down in the bureau meeting.

I know of a number of such instances. Last year a major railroad proposed a rate reduction on bauxite ore between St. Louis and Mexico, Mo., to connect with a barge movement from the Gulf. The Western Trunk Line Committee turned the proposing railroad down because it believed the new rate would seriously affect the all-rail movement from Mobile and possibly other sources.

That a barge-rail movement which is demonstrably economic and efficient for shippers and carriers alike, and needed and wanted by both, can be frustrated under these conditions suggests the need for reform of the system.

Competition based on superior efficiency is in the public interest, but competition which succeeds simply because a rate bureau has the naked power, as the ICC in 1888 suggested, of a "rudder age" is something else again. Blocking a more efficient route would seem to me to be an abuse of a rate bureau's function.

Recently, the Milwaukee railroad attempted to make itself competitive on the large volumes of corn and soybeans gathered into upper Missouri and upper Mississippi River crossings by truck. It proposed substantial reductions between points on its line to encourage rail-barge movements via river ports including Davenport and Sabula, Iowa on the Mississippi River and Council Bluffs on the Missouri. The rate bureau knocked out the proposal. Again a more efficient route was blocked despite the public benefits to the farmers and shippers of the water-rail coordination.

Veterans of the water-rail coordination battle know that the railroads sometimes use other sanctions. If a shipper gets too interested in a more efficient water-rail routing, mention is made of the difficulties he may have getting supplies of freight cars. Similarly, if a railroad gets too interested in promoting a profitable rail-water movement, someone politely mentions that connecting railroads may retaliate by re-routing important traffic over other rail lines. These are tactics of a "rudder age." One has to assume, however, that there is no nationwide conspiracy of the railroad industry to block water-rail movements and that efficient utilization of the nation's transport resources is a goal to which the railroad industry subscribes. The basic assumption must be that self-interest of individual railroads, shipper requirements for more economical movements, and the obligation and desire to provide the public with efficient services are forces which can be relied upon just as much in this segment of the economy as they can be relied upon in every other segment of the economy.

It is customary in these forums to talk theory and generality. I am departing from that tradition in citing these specific examples where rail and barge lines jointly wanted to improve water-rail coordination and are frustrated by the rate bureau. There are many other specific cases where a water-rail service would result in substantial savings to shippers and consumers. I suggest that intensive new studies be instituted on potential water-rail movements to uncover possible new examples.

Such movements should meet these criteria.

a. A reduction in the overall rate for the shipper or receiver.

b. An equally efficient water-rail service having the advantage of providing shipper and receiver with a competitive routing.

c. At least the same revenue for the railroad as received from the all-rail connection.

d. Expense of transfer at the intermediate water-rail connection to be counted as part of the water-rail rate.

Among the most fruitful fields of enquiry could certainly be the movements of manufactured iron and steel products. Oil field pipe is a good example. Water service from the Pittsburgh area to Kansas City or Memphis combined with rail service at a rate equivalent to the rail revenue from the all-rail route would provide savings of about \$3 a ton to receivers in Oklahoma and Texas. Many such instances might even permit a larger revenue for the connecting railroad and still provide the shipper with a very substantial reduction. Similar savings can be shown on water-rail movements of other steel products out of Pittsburgh to the West.

A study of the grain gathering rates would probably show the potential for large savings over present exempt truck charges. A gathering rate which attempts to block access to the river crossings simply encourages alternative means of reaching the rivers. Low cost water service is too valuable to be destroyed by such tactics. Such studies should determine whether barge lines, grain terminals, or shippers or a cooperative combination of all three, would do well to think in terms of "renting a train," as recently proposed by the Illinois Central, to perform shuttle gathering services for river crossing elevators.

Why should the railroads cooperate? First, encouragement of the most efficient routing means more business for everyone. As a matter of enlightened self-interest, cooperation may well be the best road to maximizing profits. Second, in the long run, shippers won't pay the higher rates. The interior industries will simply move to the waterways. Third, failure to develop a reasonable connecting service between rail and water common carriers simply encourages further shipper investment in private carriage.

We could be here until Christmas listing all the reasons the railroads may never cooperate in developing efficient water-rail services. But one objection of the railroads is worth a comment. They complain vigorously of the present law which specifically forbids them to own a water carrier, the so-called Panama Canal Act. The law was passed because so many water carriers on the Great Lakes and in the coastwise and intercoastal trades seemed to disappear shortly after having been acquired by railroads. Since then, though railroads have attempted at various times to acquire water carriers, they have never been able to persuade anyone that rail ownership would not mean sudden death for the water carrier industry.

A major factor, I suggest, in the present impasse on the ownership question is ignorance of the water carrier business on the part of the railroads. If they knew more about the economic potential of water transportation, and had a record of cooperation with water carriers in opening water-rail routes where such routes provide more efficient or equally efficient transportation services as the all-rail routes, the water carriers, the shippers and the Congress might feel differently about railroad ownership.

Perhaps, if railroads and barge lines were free to invest in each other's businesses, considerably short of control, but sufficient to serve as an incentive for understanding each other's problems, potentials and mutual interests, more progress could be made. There might even be an exchange of directorships, between a barge line and a railroad.

This might require Commission approval, but an experiment designed to promote better coordination of service through this sort of mutual educational exchange might be cordially received by the Commission and the Congress if both railroad and barge line asked for it. The question of control could then be taken up after a five year experimental period and progress in opening rail-water routes reviewed.

The long dispute over common ownership has tired everyone. The public is interested

in concrete results demonstrating more economical use of transportation resources. I have proposed the opening up of new water-rail routes. I have proposed an exchange of directorships for educational purposes.

While anyone in transportation is, by definition, an optimist, or he would not be in the business, I know that change comes slowly and in small steps and that in transportation, as in any business, tradition counts for more than new thinking. A. N. Whitehead, the philosopher, put it well when he said: "We cannot think first and act afterwards. From the moment of birth we are immersed in action, and can only fitfully guide it by taking thought."

Perhaps we can fitfully guide a move in the direction of opening up more efficient use of transportation resources by sensible water-rail combinations. I'm certainly willing to try. After all, the old hostilities are both artificial and unbusinesslike.

## CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

## ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the bill.

Under the previous order, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have requested this time today in order to marshal the arguments for what I consider to be the essential elements of the pending bill.

Certainly, one of the major issues before us is the question of money. The pending bill would add \$198 million to the antipoverty program for fiscal 1968, with most of that going to special private enterprise projects, which are my special care and concern, and for which I shall urge support in these remarks to the Senate. It would also add, over a 2-year period, \$2,800 million for the new Clark-Javits emergency jobs amendment.

The first question that arises is national priorities then, why should we appropriate this amount of money—well in excess of \$2 billion under title I, and a 2-year program amounting to \$2,800 million under title II—at a time when we are being pressed for economy, and when we have problems financing the war in Vietnam?

My answer to that question, Mr. President, is that a proper view of our national priorities requires it. We are giving first national priority to the war in Vietnam. I say that is proper. It is a war, and whatever may be my views on it—and it is not appropriate to discuss them



at this moment—we must pay for it, and it is entitled to the first priority if for no other reason than because it involves the lives of our servicemen overseas. Its cost is \$2 billion a month, roughly speaking—which is, in round figures, something like 20 percent of the Federal budget.

But when we get beyond that, then what, Mr. President? It is at that point that I feel we have a right to argue as to what we feel the order of national priorities should be.

In my judgment, the next national priority immediately after the Vietnam war is the crisis in the cities. Let us economize at the expense of other programs which do not bear on this crisis in the cities; but let us not undercut the programs which are our best assets in that struggle.

In the antipoverty and emergency employment legislation the Senate has before it the most critically important bill of the year to avert a winter of discontent and another summer of violence.

Mr. President, notwithstanding this fact, the administration, in my judgment, has been remiss in its estimate of the national priorities. The President took a very strong stand when it came to a \$20 million rat control bill, but we find now, however, that the White House is on the other side when we propose a job program of a size calculated to have some real impact on the problem. And that statement goes for the provisions of the antipoverty title itself, title I, and the \$198 million which I have described, as well as for the provisions of the emergency employment bill, title II.

In both cases, it is by now no secret that the administration has been neutral or against the expanded effort rather than in favor of it.

It seems to me that this represents a downgrading of the priority to which the cities are entitled by virtue of their crushing problems.

#### NEW PRIVATE ENTERPRISE PROGRAMS

Mr. President, I should like to analyze and urge the Senate to approve this \$198 million in authorization which has been added in title I.

The bulk of this new money, \$118 million, is earmarked for three new program innovations sponsored by me which relate directly to private sector participation in the war on poverty. And this is money that should have an important multiplier effect in terms of stimulating added private investment in the antipoverty programs.

It would be a mistake to suppose that there is slack in the President's request of \$2.06 billion to permit these programs to be carried out even if the committee's request is cut back to the budget figure. By and large, the budget figure involves no money for the expansion of programs—for example, Headstart will receive the same amount it got last year, and the Job Corps will get less than it actually expended last year. If we want to get private enterprise into the war on poverty, it is going to take this new money.

The first of these new programs is in many ways the most exciting. Section 123(a) (8) of the bill, added at my initiative, establishes a new program of incentives to private industry to hire and train

the hard-core poor. We have received numerous reports in the committee that the present incentives are not sufficient to encourage private firms to hire these workers, who generally require substantially more education and training before they become productive. Typically, under the on-the-job training program within the Manpower Development and Training Act or the Neighborhood Youth Corps, only a maximum of \$25 a week is allowed to the employer to cover extra training expenses. Not only is this amount often inadequate to cover the costs of training, but it in no way reimburses the employer for the lower productivity of the new worker. Nevertheless, the Department of Labor reports that on-the-job training is particularly effective where employers are willing to join the program, since, first, it results in almost certain placement, second, insures that the worker is being trained in a skill which is related to his later employment and is being trained according to the employers' own preferred techniques; and third, is directed toward placing workers in careers in the private sector rather than in Government work.

The measure which I have suggested therefore builds directly upon the concept of on-the-job training and makes it practical in industrial terms for business to take on more on-the-job trainees.

There have been other suggestions offered in recent years to encourage private industry to take on more of the manpower training effort. The Human Investment Act, of which I am a cosponsor, seeks to do this by providing a tax credit for a certain percentage of training costs. The Labor Department has constantly opposed this approach, however, on the ground that it would get the Internal Revenue Service into the business of overseeing training programs and would be too inflexible in its operation.

I believe this new approach overcomes those objections. First, the operation of the program will be lodged in the Labor Department, under a delegation agreement from the OEO. Second, it allows maximum flexibility so that the Secretary can tailor the inducements on a case-by-case or industry-by-industry basis, providing no more than is necessary to do the job. One of the difficulties with a tax approach is that it establishes a fixed subsidy not variable according to specific situations—a subsidy which may later prove to be too big or too small in actual operation.

Under this new section in the bill, the Secretary would provide reimbursements to establishments for the added costs attributable to hiring these workers, including such costs as those of on-the-job counseling and training, company transportation to and from ghetto areas, and the costs of sending recruiters into slum or depressed rural areas.

It also allows the Secretary of Labor to reimburse employers for limited periods of time when an employee might not be fully productive. Under this rubric, costs such as those of spoilage of work or of down-time on machines could be reimbursed. This is not a subsidy of normal operating costs, but rather a reimbursement of abnormal costs incurred by hiring the untrained and badly educated.

The Secretary would also have authority to provide further financial incentives if the reimbursement of added costs alone were not enough; for example, he might negotiate contracts on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis for the training and employment of persons specified by him.

The program is established on an experimental basis for the first year—\$10 million in new funds was added specifically for this purpose, though the committee report makes clear that the Department is expected to allocate at least \$15 million during fiscal year 1968 for these activities. I am hopeful that as this approach is worked out, we can slowly replace many of the classroom training programs now in use by the Government at great per capita cost.

One of the objections the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] made to this provision of the bill when he spoke on his amendment yesterday was that this would have to be a community action program effort and would have to have a community action agency to carry it out.

I wish the RECORD to show that that statement is not accurate since two provisions of the law state that the Director of OEO may handle programs of this nature directly if he finds that it is ineffective to do it through a community action program—and those are sections 122(b) and 123(c) of the bill which is before the Senate.

(At this point, Mr. HART assumed the chair.)

Mr. JAVITS. The second program in the private enterprise category, for which some \$83 million was added to the budget request of \$22 million, is the so-called Kennedy-Javits special impacts program found in title I-D of the act. Many of the changes in this program have come about by virtue of a bill which I introduced entitled "The Business and Industrial Development Act," S. 2203, on August 2, 1967.

The economic development aspects of that bill were separated in committee from the small business provisions, and Senator Kennedy and I jointly worked the economic development aspects of my bill into the special impacts program. Many of these changes were, in fact, within the intent of the special impacts program as enacted last year, but were not implemented by the Department of Labor. Thus, we have now specified that incentives may be provided to business to locate in or near eligible slum and depressed rural areas in order to provide jobs for persons in those areas.

Unlike the program now in the act, the new version of the special impact program recognizes that rural areas must also be covered, since outmigration from these areas is one of the key causes of urban poverty, and that all installations need not be located in the areas themselves, so long as they provide employment for area residents. Thus, it may be preferable, from the point of view of land availability and relocation costs, to place an industrial plant outside the slum and then reimburse a company for providing transportation for its workers.

Other new provisions added to the special impacts program are a requirement that emphasis be placed on developing ownership and managerial skills among

the poor themselves, and an application of other Federal resources under urban renewal and the Economic Development Act to the special impacts package. We contemplate that the economic and small business development aspects of the new program will be delegated to the Department of Commerce.

The third of the new programs encompasses \$25 million for small business counseling and technical assistance, to be administered by the Department of Commerce. Under this program, special effort is to be devoted to urban ghetto areas and to using the full resources of the private sector to provide business counseling and training. Thus, the bill looks toward the development of an on-the-job-training program for new entrepreneurs in existing businesses, and provides incentives to business to award subcontracts to enterprises in slums and ghettos and to aid in the upgrading of these potential subcontractors.

#### EMERGENCY JOBS BILL

The next major section of the bill which warrants our attention is the Emergency Employment Act, or the Clark-Javits bill as it is called. I might point out that my name being on the bill is fortuitous, as the bill originally was Senator CLARK's creation. My contribution was in fashioning it to give the maximum encouragement to private enterprise, and to provide for authorization to use the funds for supportive education and training.

The Emergency Employment Act provides the most direct approach to the problem of poverty and the crisis of the cities. Unlike education or housing programs, or the model cities approach, job creation and employment activity have an immediate impact in alleviating poverty. They provide money in the pocket and self-respect, and have a multiplier effect as the new money buys products and services for the employees.

Everywhere our subcommittee went we heard the same judgment—"Jobs are first," "What we need are jobs." And by providing jobs we can affect the climate in the cities before next summer, before the frustrations of poverty again break out. This is not legislating at the point of a gun; rather, it is doing what is morally right and what is pragmatically needed by this country. Let us not ignore frustration and degradation simply because it has become so acute that it has pushed a small minority into violence. What irony that would be—for Congress to refuse to do more because the situation is getting worse. In this bill, the Senate has major opportunity to do something constructive to avert a replay of this summer's outbreaks. Let us recognize the crucial nature of this bill—this is our major opportunity and perhaps our last chance to do something in time.

Some oppose this bill because they think it will simply be makework. I reject that argument. Public service jobs need not be makework; the report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress estimated that there were over 5 million public service jobs which could be usefully created. Governmental and public service jobs are the fastest growing em-

ployment category in this country. There is a very great need for new subprofessional supportive personnel in the hospitals, schools, police stations, and community service centers of the country. Tens of thousands could be employed in physical rehabilitation of our slums. Our city and national parks are being inundated under the pressure of a burgeoning and travel-conscious population—conservation and beautification personnel are in tremendous demand.

So the need is there—there is no necessity to create worthless jobs. And we have now several programs in operation which provide models for the implementation of this new effort, programs from which many lessons in job creation have been learned and from which most of the bugs have been shaken out. For example, the Nelson amendment program has been in existence for 2 years as a job creation effort in conservation work, largely for the elderly, the new careers program under the poverty act has been creating new job opportunities for the poor as aides in the public service professions, and the Neighborhood Youth Corps has served millions of youths by creating jobs in both public and private employment.

Moreover, Mr. President, this bill is not restricted to public service jobs—though the opportunities in that respect are very great—because it also allows the payment of training and employment incentives to private firms for the creation of job opportunities in other fields. This is what I spoke of when I referred to my own contributions to this emergency legislation.

Others oppose this emergency employment title because hearings were not specifically held on it. But, Mr. President, we held months of hearings on the causes of poverty and the solutions to the problems of the slums and ghettos. No more witnesses are needed to prove that jobs are the number one priority. The figures literally cry out for relief on that score. I should like to cite a few figures.

For example, a survey by the Department of Labor in November of 1966, based on 10 slum areas, showed the unemployment rate in these areas was about 10 percent, or three times the average for the rest of the country; one of every five of those slum residents working full time was earning an income below the poverty line; at least a fifth of the adult men could not even be found in the surveys, and their employment status was unknown; "subemployment" in these areas, measuring joblessness, nonparticipation in the labor force, and earnings below the poverty line, averaged 34 percent, varying from 24 percent to 47 percent; the most serious single problem was perhaps that of unemployment among nonwhite teenagers—now averaging 30 percent; and the employment gap between white and nonwhite teenagers is increasing, though the gap for adult males is narrowing.

It is for that reason I say that no more witnesses are needed to prove that jobs are the No. 1 priority. Three Presidential commissions have asserted the need for a Government job-creating program of massive dimensions. I submit

that hearings are just as effective to support a bill even if not held with reference to a specific bill number where those hearings cover the subject matter fully.

Perhaps the Emergency Employment Act could be more refined and more detail added, but legislative perfections should give way to the necessity of doing something before next summer. And it takes a while for any such program to get geared up. The Department of Labor has models—as I have pointed out—under which to work. The Congress could refine the program next year, but we should not deprive ourselves of the urgent need for this tool because of a fictitious belief that hearings have not been held. They have been held on the problem.

#### THE NEED FOR AN OEO

Mr. President, I shall conclude with a word about the vital issue before us—that of the future of the Office of Economic Opportunity itself. As my colleagues know, the agency is the target of a bill offered in the House of Representatives which would dismember it and parcel out its functions to other departments. In this body, we will be presented with a number of amendments to transfer at least some of its programs. The question is whether we are best advised to continue OEO, or by depriving it of essential parts of its activity to gradually dismantle it or make it into a staff agency at the White House level or otherwise.

I think ultimately it is right and proper that the Office of Economic Opportunity should be a staff agency, perhaps like the Office of Mobilization in the executive branch, riding herd for the President on the war on poverty activities in various traditional operating departments.

However, the time is not now and if we tried to rush the process we would do two things: First, we would dismantle the Office of Economic Opportunity; and, second, we would end up by destroying the impact of programs which have been carried on under the heading of war on poverty.

The essential argument in the minds of many who would urge us to do that is the primitive proposition that we have gotten along without a war on poverty so long, why can we not get along without it now and instead merely beef up education, child care, juvenile delinquency programs, and a few other things. This argument, Mr. President, assumes that life stands still and that there could never be a time when this great and influential society would at long last endeavor to perform the miracle which has not been performed in any other society in recorded history of setting its hand to the elimination of poverty.

There had to come a historic moment, within a nation which has mustered the resources which we have to undertake to eliminate poverty for those who do not wish to live under it if given half a chance and half a choice. That is what it comes down to, given half a chance and half a choice.

Do they desire to live under those conditions? We believe they do not, but they have not had the opportunity or choice, and that is what the war on poverty tries to give them. This is as



noble an effort as the war on smallpox or the war on yellow fever. All of this marked the onward march of society.

The war on poverty is in that noble tradition. We should be proud that at long last history has permitted us to undertake to lend a hand, because there were days when not much could be done and persons had to suffer under the weight of a curse of the ages because it was written in the heavens that there had to be poverty and there had to be poor.

Mr. President, that is the real philosophical question. If we could once free our minds in that respect, and recognize that this is a war which fully rates with any other war on the physical scourges of mankind, like disease, then we would be halfway home rather than being bogged down in doubts of doing anything about it at all.

(At this point, Mr. GORE assumed the chair.)

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from New York for his attention to one program particularly which he is introducing. I refer to the \$25 million for small business counseling, management, and training focused on the ghetto areas.

It has always seemed to me that one of the great problems we have had in this country with migration is that we had migration from Europe where Italians came here and established themselves in business—and they developed the biggest bank in the world, the Bank of America—Scandinavians came to this country and they developed all kinds of businesses in contracting, construction, and architectural firms; the Chinese came to this country and established small businesses, retail stores, laundries, restaurants, and so forth; and yet, we have had a migration of people, accelerated in the last decade, from the South to the North. The great difficulty is that these people, the Negro population, many times do not feel they are a part of the community in which they reside. There is no way in which they could translate themselves into ownership in this country. They do not own housing. Essentially they rent either from a slum landlord or from public housing. For the most part they are sold to by outside people, even in retail establishments in the community.

After the war we spent billions of dollars providing technical assistance to our enemy to rebuild and billions of dollars to our allies to rebuild, and since then to developing nations to develop business so that they could establish an economic foundation.

Yet we have not provided the kind of technical and managerial assistance to our own people—22 million people at the bottom of the economic ladder.

Mr. President, a year and a half ago, a group of us in the city of Chicago got together under the name of the New Illinois Committee, which I have been honored to chair, to see whether we could not get businessmen in Chicago to provide technical assistance to its own city residents. A group of 40 to 50 aggressive,

young, able executives, sales managers, industrial engineers, accountants, and lawyers are ready to go to work to assist any small business in the minority element in the ghetto areas of the city to keep their businesses going, which are now struggling to survive, or in providing counsel and advice to help a business get underway.

I think that this constructive approach being taken by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is in an area of urgent need. It will solve or help to solve many of the problems we see ahead. It is certainly the right kind of thing to do in the right way, to make taxpayers out of citizens who feel a sense of exploitation, and to make them entrepreneurs and owners of businesses in this country, just as many of us are working to have them become owners of their own housing.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not know of a Member of the Senate whose approval upon this particular question would be more apposite, not only gratifying to me as a Senator and friend, but also apposite to the issue. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] is in his own right a very distinguished and highly successful business leader. He understands a thing or two about business success, its consequences to the person who succeeds, and its importance to the community.

As he only intimated, he is himself the author of a very distinguished plan, in which so many of us have joined him, to encourage homeownership. The direct complement of homeownership is business ownership. This is not beyond the ken of the poor, any more than learning a skill, getting a job, or raising a family.

Therefore, I welcome very much the comradeship and the assistance of the Senator from Illinois in this matter. It is a very strong confirmation of the soundness of the lines we want to pursue.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to yield to my good friend from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the eloquent statement of the Senator from New York on the purposes and need of the poverty program. I have always supported this program.

I have, though, been very desirous that the most effective program would be developed in the committees of the Congress, and I have taken comfort from the fact that the Senator from New York is a member of the committee which develops and presents this program to the Senate.

However, I have been discouraged, because after 3 years, it seems to me that the program is not as effective as it could be.

I believe that the program, to be successful, must have the full cooperation and support of the States and local governments, in terms of resources, participation, and in terms of the involvement of the people of the community and in the State.

I note that in the case of committees established to initiate and administer community action programs—it was recommended by the administration that State and local officials, or the appropriate officials of the community must be

included in the membership of the governing local committee. But the Senate committee did not accept the recommendations of the administration to mandatorily include such officials.

It seems to me that from the standpoint of securing the resources and the cooperation of the government of the area, it would be important and necessary to include the appropriate officials of the community on such a committee; also, to assure the local responsibility needed it seems to me that local officials ought to be included. I ask the Senator, why did the Senate committee take the position that the inclusion of local officials be not required?

Mr. JAVITS. The danger, Mr. President, is in domination. It was felt that if we were to encourage participation by the poor themselves in the Community Action boards and agencies that these were people who might be dominated—overwhelmed as it were—by the presence of important civic figures.

One cannot in any case keep a major from exerting an important, perhaps preponderant influence on these matters—no one really expects that we can. We only add to the possibility of undercutting real participation by the poor themselves if we insist that important public officials actually sit on such a board.

I do not feel that strongly about it myself. I feel that such officials could be part of a board, provided they do not dominate the board. I would be willing to run that risk, in order to give maximum flexibility and support in organizing those boards and agencies.

I think that we will find in the amendment process, in the course of the next few days, that that will be taken care of.

Mr. COOPER. I recognize the problem that the Senator has stated. I am sure that one of the considerations the committee has taken to mind is the possibility that in certain areas of the county—and I say this without any derogation—in the South and elsewhere, because of the problems of integration, it might not be possible to secure an effective organization.

The Senator has stated another problem, that the poor might believe they were being dominated by a local official. That is counseling fear too much, when we consider the necessity of reaching the leadership and resources of local governments.

If this poverty program is to succeed, if we want it to succeed—and the Senator is doing everything he can to make it succeed, as I want it to succeed—I believe it would be a mistake not to include these officials.

The OEO Director has procedural power to guarantee, as I see it, the initiation of programs and even though there is local opposition.

I do not see any danger from that score. I have witnessed in life and in experience the advancement of the great majority of the people of the country in income, in opportunities for educational, cultural, and recreational opportunities for which we are thankful. But all around live other groups of people who have gone backwards, relatively and absolutely. Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. JAVITS. I do. I think that the gap widens rather than narrows.

Mr. COOPER. Yes. We are in danger, in some places in this country, of having a class system, which would be contrary to the promises held out by our country to all our citizens. I believe this program is necessary, but I must say I cannot see how the problems will ever be met and how these people will be given the opportunity to lift themselves up unless the full resources of our country—Federal, State, local, and private—are united.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. COOPER. This is the chief reason I argue that the participation of local government officials is required.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for another 5 minutes, to conclude my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], may I direct his attention and that of other Senators to page 49 of the report, which contemplates inclusion on such boards of the chief elected official or his representative; but it is not elevated to the status of legislation.

I personally would not have any major objections to the inclusion in the bill itself of provision for such officials, though we did contemplate it in the report.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I think the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has an amendment—No. 345—which does precisely what the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has in mind.

Mr. JAVITS. That was one of the amendments that went over.

Mr. President, to conclude my statement, perhaps the most critical question facing the Congress this year concerning the war on poverty is the future of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Our subcommittee heard testimony in over a dozen cities. We received reports from seven independent consulting firms analyzing community action programs throughout the country. We have had dozens of reports from our own special study staff.

In my judgment, a review of this record results in only one conclusion that can be drawn—that it is crucial to the war on poverty and to the climate of opinion in the slums that the Office of Economic Opportunity be preserved.

I said before that it could be slowly phased out—I believe it should be—but I do not think we should dismember it. I think we ought to phase it out gradually, particular activity by particular activity. Some of OEO programs have already gone to other Government departments, and more will. But the point is that the war on poverty attempts to construct an all-points attack, recognizing that the problem, in addition to lack of education, job training, or decent housing, is the problem of personal dignity and the whole spectrum of needs.

All this dictates the continuance of the agency.

Moreover, I would doubt that we would have many of the antipoverty programs we now have if we had had to rely upon innovations from established agencies. Would the Office of Education in HEW have produced Headstart? Would the Justice Department have evolved the legal-services-for-the-poor concept? Would the Department of HUD have evolved the community action program? OEO has been and continues to be innovative. To deprive it of the bulk of its operating programs would drastically reduce its ability to induce institutional change in other Federal departments and in local agencies.

In addition, the existence of an OEO with substantial operating funds provides the communities with a kind of local initiative which is not possible under other programs. Community action is basically a block grant, a concept so dear to my colleagues on the Republican side, and one which I believe to be proper as the next step in a proper reshaping of our federal system.

Under community action, a locality is given a pot of money with which it can do almost as it wishes, within certain very broad program limits and procedural requirements such as participation of the poor. If it feels that it particularly needs funds for remedial education, it can spend its money for that purpose; if it wants job training, that is possible. In this manner, communities can fill the shortcomings and interstices left by other Federal programs and can that way tailor the whole package more closely to local conditions.

Finally, OEO is important for another equally important set of reasons—its psychological importance. It is perfectly clear to me, and I know it to be the case in New York City, that the agency is more than a set of programs—it is a symbol of Government concern for the poor. To the slum dweller and the resident of a depressed rural area, the existence of the OEO means that the Federal Government recognizes the problem of poverty—its budget is, to him, the measure of governmental concern. More than that, the OEO programs at the local level are community programs—they are not handed down from above but are locally selected and, at least to some extent, are governed by community people. That approach is unique among Federal programs. That poor people think this to be a program for them and by them—this to me accounts for the positive record of OEO during this summer's riots. Of over 30,000 community action employees, only 16 were arrested, and of these only 6 were full-time workers. None have been convicted. And of 244 buildings which the poverty program has in the heart of the riot areas, none were burned or destroyed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for all those reasons, and with special reference

to permitting the encouragement of private enterprise activity in this field, I think in essence the bill is right, though I do not foreclose myself from supporting an amendment or two. In essence, the bill is right. The war on poverty is an OEO activity and it should continue to head it. I am against dismembering OEO. If we did, we would definitely end the hope for winning the war on poverty, and this would be a disastrous blow to the aspirations, destiny, and hopes of our Nation.

I yield the floor, and I am grateful to the Senator from New Mexico for indulging me a few extra minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 343.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is pending. Does the Senator wish to have it read again at this time?

Mr. MONTROYA. No. I should like to give a little more explanation of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. MONTROYA. The amendment is designed to cure what I consider is a grave deficiency in the Economic Opportunity Act. The original Economic Opportunity Act, while it was designed to help poor people throughout the country to organize community effort, which was sanctioned by its provisions, had no requirement that the governing board of such community effort should have representation by the poor people.

A subsequent amendment, of 1966, incorporated such a provision so as to insure that in a community one-third of the membership of a governing board should be representative of those people. This provision has now been in effect for a year, and there is continuing concern as to whether such a group in a community is clearly and effectively represented on community action boards.

My amendment is designed to insure that the entire spectrum of a community be represented on the boards. I have tried through the amendment to cure this deficiency.

This particular amendment, No. 343, prescribes that the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity shall prescribe and promulgate nationally such regulations as will insure a democratic process and procedure in the deliberations of the boards. It has been my observation of many community action groups that a quorum, which is required under the articles of incorporation or under other systems of operation, usually assembles and convenes the meetings.

Then, after prolonged deliberation or consideration, members of the board will walk out, and, with the record and the minutes of the hearing showing a quorum present, the remaining members—



who might be a minority of the board at that stage of the proceedings—conduct business and pass on important policy matters; and thereafter, the community complains that the action taken is inimical to the objectives as outlined in other meetings previously held, and great dissension occurs.

Under my amendment, the obligation devolves upon the OEO director to promulgate uniform rules and regulations so as to insure majority participation at important stages of deliberation by the community action boards throughout the country. At present we have a lack of uniformity in this respect, because there are no rules issued from Washington to govern the action of the local community boards. The conduct of the proceedings, up to now, has been dependent upon local whims, local innovations, or locally prescribed methods of procedure.

So, with the lack of national uniformity, we may have uniformity proliferating within a State or within a municipality, which may come to govern the proceedings of its community action boards. Thus the Washington office, in evaluating whether the democratic process actually was observed, is hampered, because the office here in Washington, in trying to evaluate whether or not there was propriety in the proceedings, has to go back to the local board and analyze its customs and the procedures to which it has adhered in other deliberations.

My amendment would seek to bring about the kind of uniformity that would tell these local action boards "You will adhere to these rules of procedure, print them and provide them to all those who are interested in your deliberations, especially to members of your governing board and to the neighborhood associations, so that they, in turn, will inform the people as to what can be done under what circumstances, what procedure has to be adhered to, and what notices of public meetings must be posted, and in what manner." All these things will have to be prescribed by the OEO Director.

I cite an example of what I believe is a very flagrant violation of the purposes Congress had in mind when we enacted the antipoverty legislation: In one community in New Mexico, when it was sought to organize a community action committee, the original notices which went out provided for an election to be held at 2 o'clock on a weekday afternoon. This is a mining community. On a weekday at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, none of the workers in the region were able to be present or represented in the election process. Nevertheless, the election was held; and so many of their leaders were not represented on the board because they could not attend the election.

I took the matter up with the OEO Director, and asked him if he could have another election in that community, which could be held in the evening, so that the people themselves would have a voice in the selection of the board.

I have not received an answer yet as to what the OEO Director can do. However, I do know that there is no Federal regulation or provision in the Federal

law to prevent this kind of thing happening.

I know of another instance in my State where they had an annual election as prescribed by the articles of organization of the community action group, and the people ousted the in-group and elected a new group.

The old group which had been ousted refused to turn over the records. Then the State Office of Economic Opportunity, under the Governor's office, sent a letter to the new group asking them to hold a new election and saying that the election which had been held was not properly held.

The new group consulted me on this matter, and this was my advice to the duly elected new group: That the State Office of Economic Opportunity had no right to interfere and to say whether an election held was duly held, that that was a matter for the OEO in Washington to determine whether the election had been properly held, and that in the absence of such a finding by Washington or by the regional office of the OEO, they should consider themselves duly elected if they had adhered to all of the procedures in their articles of incorporation.

Mr. President, these things are happening all over the country. And I think it is about time that we develop a kind of uniformity of procedure by which everyone will be conscious of the steps that have to be taken to insure the carrying out of the democratic process which is encompassed in the spirit and the law of the Economic Opportunity Act as originally passed and as it has been amended and as we will amend it this week through the enactment of the pending bill.

I fully appreciate the great effort that has been put forth by the committee in trying to bring before the Senate a very good bill.

Our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], has performed an enormous job in going all over the country, as have members of his subcommittee, and trying to find out what people need, want, and require so that we might put a better sense of direction into the economic opportunity program.

The members of the committee deserve the commendation of not only Congress, but also the country. The volumes of hearings on the desks of every Senator testify to the great task which has been performed by the committee members.

My purpose in offering amendments today is to try to perfect a modus operandi to try to take care of those very things which militate against the efficient operation of this vital program.

The pending amendment, amendment No. 343, imposes upon the National Director the duty of promulgating such standards and rules relating to the scheduling and notice of meetings, quorums, procedures, establishment of committees and similar matters as he may deem necessary to assure the democratic process.

The pending amendment is vitally needed to delineate, to specify, and to bring about a more definitive approach to take care of this problem about which I have spoken here today.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have given a good deal of thought to the pending amendment. I have discussed the amendment with the Senator from New Mexico and with his staff.

To me, the amendment is entirely appropriate and I would be glad to accept it. I do not know how my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], feels about it. However, for myself I see nothing wrong with the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the ranking minority member of the committee, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], will wish to be heard, albeit briefly, in a very few minutes.

Speaking for myself, I do think, as someone said here yesterday, and not facetiously, that these are better rules than the Senate operates by.

The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has always made a valiant fight to change the rules of the Senate.

I believe that the rules encompassed in amendment No. 343 with relation to the conduct of the community action program would constitute a very desirable change. I shall support it.

I do have a certain reservation with respect to amendment No. 345 which is in the group of amendments presented here. I have no objection, however, to amendment No. 343.

In order to preserve the right of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] to address himself to all of these amendments, I should like to have the Senator from New Mexico bear with me momentarily so that we might discuss amendment No. 345, as that is an amendment he will offer shortly, an amendment which the Senator from Pennsylvania will undoubtedly address himself to in the same manner. As far as the Senator from Pennsylvania is concerned, that amendment will also be satisfactory.

What disquiets me about amendment No. 345 is not the substance of it. I think the substance is entirely sound—that is, that there should be an opportunity for representation upon these boards and agencies of the chief elected official and other appropriate elected officials. In that, I should say I agree with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who spoke earlier today.

What does bother me is the stratifying of it in the context of a one-third requirement. What troubles me about that, frankly, is that there are persons in communities in this country—and we all recognize the fact—who, if a mandatory requirement is made for one-third of the public officials, will take all the places themselves and will comprise such a powerhouse in terms of the establishment that they really will dominate any such committee or agency.

It seems to me that such a proposal as is now presented would play directly into the hands of interests which might be hostile to conducting the war on poverty and which could immobilize it in many ways, especially by the impact of their own authority and their own personalities in terms of having so large a number of places absolutely guaranteed to them.

I might point out that this approach

was originally used by the administration though without the one-third requirement. However, the committee did not go along with it, although the administration had proposed it. The administration proposal is contained in an amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], amendment No. 349, which, it seems to me, quite adequately guarantees representation of exactly the kind which amendment No. 345 calls for, but does not stratify it in such a way as to endanger the integrity, in my judgment, of particular local boards.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MONTOYA. The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has requested that I join his name as a cosponsor of this particular amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] be added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 345.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the Senator this question: So long as he and Senator MONRONEY are joining, which I think is splendid, what would the Senator think of going one step further and adopting the language of his amendment to the language of the Monroney amendment, thereby relieving people such as myself of the element of concern that there are areas in the country—unfortunately, not a few areas but more than a few—where, if you build in this one-third requirement, you will be running afoul of the danger of a board which really would be overwhelmed or really would be dominated? Would the Senator consider conforming his amendment, so long as he has joined with Senator MONRONEY, to the original administration language? It is not my language; it is the administration language.

Mr. MONTOYA. What is the original administration language?

Mr. JAVITS. The original language is essentially contained in amendment No. 349 of Senator MONRONEY:

SEC. 213. (a) A community action agency shall be established in order to assure broad, continuing, and effective community participation in all phases of the community action program for which it is responsible, and to assure that the program as developed and implemented is fully responsive to community needs and conditions. Each such agency shall have, for this purpose, a governing board organized to provide for membership of the chief elected official or officials of the community and other appropriate public officials, or their representatives, of officials or representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community.

In short, it just does not lock in the one-third requirement, but it does everything that the Senator from New Mexico desires be done.

Mr. MONTOYA. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MONTOYA. Would this language reassure the Senator from New York,

with respect to provision (d) on page 2 of my amendment:

The remainder of the board shall consist of officials or representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, and other major groups and interests in the community.

Mr. JAVITS. I have pointed out that that is exactly what Senator MONRONEY's amendment provides for, but it leaves out the mandatory requirement for one-third of the places. It leaves it flexible and open to the local situation, and there may be cases in a locality where one-third would be fine, perhaps even more. But there are localities in the country where, if you write in a one-third requirement, you will guarantee a dominated board or agency because of a local situation. That is why I suggested to the Senator from New Mexico the elimination of the mandatory one-third—just leaving it open.

Mr. MONTOYA. Would the Senator agree to a compromise of this nature: Instead of saying "which does not have at least one-third," using the words "which does not have close to one-third"?

Mr. JAVITS. I would not, because I believe the Senator is defeating his own purpose. If the Senator just said that they are to afford an opportunity for membership or representation, that is if the Senator just said "which is conducted, administered or coordinated by a board which affords an opportunity for membership," and so forth, I could support it.

Just leave out the freezing in of an absolute one-third requirement, and that would leave the program free and in the position of being able to adapt to local situations where one-third could result in a dominated board. That is the only point I press.

Mr. MONTOYA. Would this language be acceptable to the Senator from New York:

The director shall not approve, or continue to fund after June 1, 1968, a community action program, which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board which affords an opportunity for membership or representation to the chief elected officials.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator would have to use the words "which does not afford."

Mr. MONTOYA. "Which does not afford."

Mr. JAVITS. That is the way the grammar is constructed.

Mr. MONTOYA. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. That wording would be acceptable to me, and I would thank the Senator if he would conform it accordingly. The amendment is not up for consideration as yet.

Mr. MONTOYA. Yes. I will certainly offer that as a modification.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as I understand it, the effect of the amendment proposed by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico would be to make it mandatory for the Director of OEO to promulgate rules for local community action agencies relating to the scheduling and notice of meetings, forms, procedures, establishment of committees, and so forth.

I regretfully find it necessary to oppose the adoption of this amendment, because, as I have suggested, it would write into the law specific mandates for the Director of OEO to regulate every community action agency throughout the Government from Washington.

As I pointed out in my remarks on the floor of the Senate on Monday, I believe that the concept of community neighborhood corporations and local community action agencies can do much for relieving the isolation and alienation expressed by the disadvantaged living in our large cities.

However, once the Director of OEO is put in a position of having to establish elaborate regulations governing every procedure by a local community action agency, we deprive that local agency of necessary autonomy to work out its own problems.

I am sure that every Member of the Senate recognizes that an organization can grow in self-confidence and responsibility, and finally can assume additional authority by having some freedom in working out procedures and regulations which are most applicable to its local area. If we become obsessed with dotting every "i" and establishing every format and every procedure which guides the local agency, we will be taking away its power to grow in strength and to accommodate itself to local conditions.

I found it most interesting to read accounts of Daniel Moynihan's speech before the Americans for Democratic Action. In that speech he pointed out:

Liberals should divest themselves of the notion that the Nation can be run from agencies in Washington and should work toward a decentralization of government powers.

While the proposed amendment, on its face, would do little more than put into the legislation a practice already being followed by OEO, it could be argued that there is no justifiable reason for opposing it. However, we have reached the point where we either have faith in the community action concept or we do not. I, for one, believe that the local community action agencies need some autonomy, and we at the Federal level should not write into the law language which is contrary to the principle of decentralization and local autonomy.

Mr. President, I shall not ask for the yeas and nays. I yield the floor.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I disagree with the interpretation of this amendment by my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Vermont. This is not a centralization amendment. This is an amendment which would insure for the people at the community level the type of democratic process that was envisioned by Congress in enacting the original law.

This is in furtherance of the democratic concept that people should have a majority voice in the deliberations of the community action committees which are organized pursuant to the authorization of this law. I see nothing akin to what the Senator from Vermont has related, and which draws an interpretation of centralization of power here in Washington. It merely provides for promulgation of definite and uniform rules of procedure



so as to assure to the majority that their voice will carry in deliberations and insure to the minority that they will be heard at the local level in the deliberations that might transpire within the purview of the act.

Mr. President, that is all the amendment does. I am sorry I do not have the support of my good friend from Vermont. I had no intention of bringing about the result he has given in his interpretation of this bill. Therefore, I do not think I have anything further to say other than to reiterate that I am motivated by a desire to insure more democracy to people at the local level in exercising or using their voice within the purview of this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask for a vote on the amendment if no one else does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Is there a division?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. All those in favor say "aye."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, a point of order. The vote was already in progress. The Chair had already called for the question.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum. The vote has not been completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, would a point of order be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to request a division.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I request a division. Before that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MONTTOYA. Will the Senator withhold the request for a quorum temporarily? Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, can a division be requested after the vote is started?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The result had not been announced.

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, can a division be requested after the vote is started, but before the result is announced?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It must be requested before the result is announced.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask for a division vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the pending amendment. A division has been requested. [Putting the question.]

On a division, the amendment was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 344

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 344.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 46, in line 11, strike out the words "public and" and insert in lieu thereof "Federal, State, and local public resources, as well as all available".

Beginning on page 46, at line 23, strike out everything after the period in that line through the period in line 1 on page 47, and insert in lieu thereof "In order to merit financial assistance under this title, a community action agency shall be responsible for and must be capable of planning, conducting, administering, and evaluating a community action program, and, to the extent permitted by relevant law, be capable of mobilizing all Federal, State, and local public resources, as well as all available private resources."

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, on yesterday I explained what this amendment is designed to do. I do not desire to take too much time today except to say by way of preface that the present Economic Opportunity Act does not concisely and precisely state what the duties of the community action committees or boards might be.

There is a misconception, in many parts of the country, on the part of those who are on these committees, that their duties are confined to those operations which come strictly and only within the purview of the OEO Act, such as projects like Headstart, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Legal Aid, and other related activities which are provided for in the OEO Act.

But there is a stated purpose which was delineated in the committee report by Congress when it enacted the legislation that the community action group or agencies should serve as catalysts for community action and community approach with respect to poverty and economic development.

My amendment tends to create more definitively these duties for the community action groups. It says specifically that they are to marshal the resources of a community from the local governmental unit, the Federal agencies and the private sources, and to blueprint a plan of action. They are to serve as catalysts in such a movement. That is what Congress had in mind. But they have more or less refused to shoulder this

responsibility in many areas of the country.

That is why we have such criticism of the OEO programs because they have not expanded their sphere of activities to try to bring about a more comprehensive approach to the economic problems which these communities face.

My amendment puts a responsibility on the CAP agency to plan, to conduct, to administer, and to evaluate the community action program and, to the extent permitted by relevant law, to provide the capability to mobilize all Federal, State, and local public resources, as well as all available private resources.

This is not designed to impose a superstructure known as community action agency upon all the other departments of the Federal or local governments. This is merely something that will sanction and direct the community action agency to go to all these public agencies and try to tell them, "This is what we can do. This is where you can help. Together, acting in concert, we can help this community through the different Federal programs under the different Federal agencies."

They cannot superimpose their will upon these Federal agencies. This directs them to consult with them so that some kind of formidable plan and formidable approach can evolve through the collective efforts on the part of Federal agencies and the CAP agency.

Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. I do not think there is any controversy to it. I think it will do worlds of good. It will stimulate action among the community action agencies throughout the country, once they know what Congress expects them to do.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I see nothing objectionable about this amendment. For myself, I would be happy to accept it.

All it does is to put into legislative language what is being done, anyway, administratively by OEO. The amendment has some merit in making it specific and putting it in the bill.

However, I do not know what my friends on the other side of the aisle think. Accordingly, I yield to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am opposed to this amendment. First of all, as the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has just pointed out, OEO is now doing administratively exactly what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico seeks to achieve with this additional language. If that is the case, it seems to me that adoption of this amendment would be superfluous.

If that were the only fault, Mr. President, I would not object to its adoption. However, I believe that specifying coordination of Federal, State, and local activities in the law raises several serious objections.

First, Sargent Shriver has pointed out that community action agencies perform the best services in those areas where they receive cooperation from local government. Now, if we specifically point out in the law that a community action agency is in effect short-circuiting State and local governments, I believe

that many local governments will resent this intrusion and will be less cooperative in our all-out efforts to combat poverty.

Second, Mr. President, I believe that we have seen that there are at least several States which are doing a better job of coordination than any community action agency could ever hope to attain. I am thinking specifically, Mr. President, of the State of New Jersey, where Paul Yluisaker, formerly with the Ford Foundation, became statewide director of community affairs. In the State of New Jersey, I believe we are seeing an excellent use of State government to achieve coordination. If we become too specific in granting the local community action agency this broad authority for coordination, we may well undermine the coordination efforts by many of our States and local communities.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge that this amendment, which everyone seems to admit is not really necessary, be rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am interested in what the Senator from Vermont just said. However, we have conferred with Mr. Shriver's office; and the OEO people, it is my understanding, have no objection to the amendment. In fact, they helped to draft it. Thus, I think we can legitimately say that this amendment is not opposed by the OEO. That is one reason why I was prepared to take it, let me say to my good friend from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. The mere fact that OEO does not oppose the amendment does not necessarily make it a good amendment, in my view.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico. The amendment was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 345

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 345 and ask that it be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 48, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) The Director shall not approve, or continue to fund after June 1, 1968, a community action program, which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board which does not have at least one-third of the authorized places thereon designated so as to afford an opportunity for membership or representation to the chief elected official or officials of the community and other appropriate public officials or their representatives. Failure of those officials to avail themselves of all or part of the places so designated shall not, however, preclude establishment of an alternate board structure which is broadly representative of the community and otherwise consistent with the requirements of this section. The Director may require, with respect to the places designated for occupancy by public officials, that appropriate representation be provided for State or regional agencies, in situations in which a community action agency serves two or more counties."

On page 48, at the beginning of line 15, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)".

On page 48, between lines 24 and 25, insert the following:

"(d) The remainder of the board shall consist of officials or representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing

assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community."

On page 48, in line 25, strike out the subsection designation "(c)" and insert in lieu thereof "(e)".

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, I submit a modified amendment, in lieu of the pending amendment, which is in line with the colloquy the Senator from New York and I had.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as modified will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 48, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following new subsection:

"(b) The Director shall not approve, or continue to fund after June 1, 1968, a community action program, which is conducted, administered, or coordinated by a board which does not afford an opportunity for membership or representation to the chief elected official or officials of the community and other appropriate public officials or their representatives. Failure of those officials to avail themselves of all or part of the places so designated shall not, however, preclude establishment of an alternate board structure which is broadly representative of the community and otherwise consistent with the requirements of this section. The Director may require, with respect to the places designated for occupancy by public officials, that appropriate representation be provided for State or regional agencies, in situations in which a community action agency serves two or more counties."

"(d) The remainder of the board shall consist of officials or representatives of private groups and agencies engaged in providing assistance to the poor, and of appropriate representatives of business, labor, religious, or other major groups and interests in the community."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico desire that the amendments be considered en bloc?

Mr. MONTTOYA. Yes, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MONTTOYA. Mr. President, as I stated before in my colloquy with the Senator from New York and as I stated yesterday, originally the Economic Opportunity Act did not have a specific provision providing for one-third participation on the part of the poor in the composition of community action boards.

Then, in 1966, by virtue of an amendment, the Congress put in a provision insuring this participation, although the instructions from OEO throughout the country initially had been to give the poor representation on these boards. This was followed generally throughout the country. Then the mandate of the Congress last year insured this participation.

There was no provision in the law, there was no history in the legislation, and there was no encouragement, perhaps, from OEO that the local officials or the local business communities should participate, although they did participate, in the composition of the boards in most instances.

I feel that it is vitally necessary for the local officials, be they county or municipal officials, to participate in the planning and deliberations of community action agencies, because, in many in-

stances, coordinating with the local governmental set-up is most essential to insure the success of the local programs.

While this has been a matter of practice, it is not in the law as a matter of mandate; and my amendment is designed to accomplish this purpose.

In addition, the second part of my amendment carries another provision which encourages within the composition of these boards the participation of business, labor, religious groups, and other major groups and interests in the community. This is the first time that this section will appear in the Economic Opportunity Act. It will insure a general-spectrum representation in the community action agency.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONTTOYA. Yes; I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Reading the Senator's amendment, it states, on line 8, at page 1, "Chief elected official or officials of the community." Would the Senator spell out for me what he means by "officials of the community?"

Mr. MONTTOYA. Perhaps the mayor.

Mr. MURPHY. Who would be the "chief?"

Mr. MONTTOYA. Perhaps the members of the city council.

Mr. MURPHY. I see.

Mr. MONTTOYA. County officials.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding is that there are a number of rural community action agencies which serve a number of counties and many of these communities have three or more supervisors or officials as the chief elected officials. Sometimes there are two from one party and one from the other. To have each of them on a local board might result in an over-large governing board. I would assume the Senator from New Mexico would accept a reasonable interpretation so that if perhaps there were officials from several local governments, representation could be amicably worked out so that, for example, one from a community could be the representative if there were three. The question is, How big is the community? Where the community is co-terminous with the city, it is simple. Where it goes out and takes in surrounding counties, it is more difficult administratively.

Mr. MONTTOYA. I may say to the Senator from California, and in answer to the query of the Senator from Pennsylvania, that originally, in the amendment which I first proposed, I had a requirement that one-third of the board be comprised of elected officials. I gave serious thought to the very question the Senator from California has raised, and concluded that such representation might not become possible where there were more than two counties, where there was a group of communities, and so forth. So that was the purpose of my modification. So the provision for a minimum one-third was taken out of the amendment and there was merely a statement of the purpose that some of the elected officials should be given participation in these boards.



Mr. MURPHY. That was the purpose of my question. I thank the Senator for explaining it.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONTTOYA. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I think the modified language represents language which is much superior and preferable to that which is in the bill, and I am happy to support it.

Mr. MONTTOYA. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONTTOYA. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I have just entered the Chamber; is it correct that the Senator's amendment would provide that the appropriate local officials must be members of local governing agencies or boards?

Mr. MONTTOYA. It is not a mandatory requirement; it is merely an encouragement that there be participation in the membership of the board on the part of local or county officials, or if there is more than one county, there is provision for regional membership within that stated group.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me briefly, I think I can satisfy the Senator from Kentucky, who said he just came into the Chamber. If he will look at lines 7, 8, and 9 of the first page of the Senator's amendment, he will see that an opportunity for membership or representation to the chief elected official or officials of the community and other appropriate public officials or their representatives is to be given. Then if they do not want to go on, they do not have to.

Mr. COOPER. An opportunity. I noted that the bill sent up by the administration provided that appropriate local officials should be members of the governing board supervising the community action programs. Is that correct?

Mr. MONTTOYA. I had that provision in my original amendment. Now it is permissive.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. The committee gave that matter a great deal of consideration. We found in our inquiries that a good many local officials do not want to go on the boards and prefer to have the community action boards function without their participation. Accordingly, we thought that to force them to go on the boards when they did not want to was unwise, and we changed the administration's position.

Mr. COOPER. The original language provided that the chief official or a representative of the local government should be a member. Did it not require that the chief local officials should be members?

Mr. CLARK. It was a mandatory provision of the administration bill. I asked my friend from Vermont whether or not he agreed with that provision, and I think he felt that it was better to leave it permissive, and not make it mandatory.

Mr. COOPER. I propose to offer an amendment which would make it mandatory, but I shall not stand in the way of the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from New Mexico, because I think it is an improvement.

At the proper time I shall offer an

amendment, and call it up, to make it mandatory that the chief official, or at least delegated officials of the local government, shall be members of these boards. I shall not take the time of the Senate now to give my reasons, but I intend to do so at an appropriate time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have no objection to the proposal of the Senator from New Mexico. It is my understanding that the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from California, both members of the committee, are in accord, so I am prepared to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico, as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is contemplated that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] will now call up his amendment, which would transfer the Headstart program to the Office of Education. I would anticipate that he and I, with the cooperation of the leadership, could agree on a limit of time for debate on that amendment. However, I see that the Senator is not in the Chamber at the moment.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to work out a unanimous-consent agreement with the Senator. However, the acting majority leader, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] suggests that the Senator from Colorado talk on his amendment for a while first.

Mr. DOMINICK. That will be satisfactory.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 342

Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 342.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

On page 74, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following new paragraph:

"(7) Beginning after June 30, 1968, no financial assistance shall be extended under this title to provide comprehensive educational programs and services for young children who have not reached the age of compulsory school attendance or such programs and services designed to benefit children in kindergarten or elementary school."

On page 126, after line 11, add the following new title:

#### "TITLE III—AMENDMENT TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 RELATING TO PRESCHOOL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

##### "PRESCHOOL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

"SEC. 301. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by redesignating title VII as title VIII, by redesignating sections 701 through 706 and references thereto as section 801 through 806, respectively, and by adding after title VI the following new title:

#### "TITLE VII—PRESCHOOL PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

##### "ALLOTMENT TO STATES

"SEC. 701. From the sums appropriated to make basic grants under this title for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall allot not more than 2 per centum among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and the Virgin Islands, according to their respective needs. He shall also reserve not more than 10 per centum of those sums for allotment in accordance with such criteria and procedures as he may prescribe. The remainder shall be allotted among the States, in accordance with the latest available data, so that equal proportions are distributed on the basis of (1) the relative number of public assistance recipients in each State as compared to all States, (2) the average number of unemployed persons in each State as compared to all States, and (3) the relative number of related children living with families with incomes of less than \$1,000 in each State as compared to all States. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term "State" does not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. That part of any State allotment which the Commissioner determines will not be needed may be reallocated, on such dates during the fiscal year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States, in proportion to their original allotments, but with appropriate adjustments to assure that any amount so made available to any State in excess of its needs is similarly reallocated among the other States.

##### "STATE PLANS

"SEC. 702. (a) Any State which desires to receive grants under this title shall submit to the Commissioner, through its State educational agency, a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

"(1) provides that the State educational agency will be the sole State agency for the administration of the State plan;

"(2) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 701 will be used solely to make grants to community action boards (established pursuant to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964), or in any community where there is no qualified community action board, to local educational agencies to assist them in carrying on preschool programs which, under subsection (b), are eligible for assistance under this title;

"(3) provides that effective procedures will be adopted for acquiring and disseminating to teachers and administrators significant information derived from educational research, demonstration, and similar projects, and for adopting, where appropriate, promising educational practices developed through such projects;

"(4) provides for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including any funds paid by the State to any other agency) under this title;

"(5) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(6) provides a balanced program to meet the educational, nutritional, health, clothing, and other unique needs of children from impoverished backgrounds in order for them to function at optimum levels in relationship to other children; and

"(7) provides a standard of poverty for individuals and families in the State that takes into account the number of children, dependents, and other special circumstances substantially affecting the ability of individuals and families to be self-sustaining.

"(b) A preschool program shall be eligible for assistance under this title if (1) it is designed to prepare educationally deprived children, aged three through seven, in areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families to successfully undertake the regular elementary school program, (2) it is carried on by, or under contracts or arrangements with, a community action board, or, if carried on in an area in which there is no community action board, is carried on by a local educational agency, and (3) it is limited to participation by children from families meeting the poverty standards established under section 702(a) (7).

"(c) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which meets the requirements of subsection (a).

#### "PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 703. (a) From the amounts allotted to each State under section 701, the Commissioner shall pay to each State an amount equal to the Federal share of the expenditures made by such State in carrying out its State plan. Such payments may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments and underpayments.

"(b) For purposes of subsection (a), the Federal share for each State shall be 90 per centum for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1969, and June 30, 1970.

#### "ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

"SEC. 704. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency administering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to such agency, finds—

"(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 702(a), or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

"(c) In the event a State shall, within a reasonable time, fail to submit a State plan, or shall fail to submit an acceptable State plan under circumstances that the Commissioner believes indicate a desire on the part of State officials to prevent operation of any acceptable program under this title within the State, the Commissioner is authorized to contract directly with qualified community action boards, or in any community where there is no qualified community action boards, directly with educational agencies to implement programs under this title within such State.

#### "JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 705. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 702(a) or with his final action under section 704(b), such State may within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of

the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

#### "AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 706. (a) The Commissioner shall carry out the programs provided for in this title during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and the succeeding fiscal year. There is authorized to be appropriated \$375,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and \$400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, to make grants to States for preschool programs under this title."

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, this is a fairly long amendment which is why I asked that the clerk not read it. I do not intend to take up very much time. I understand that the distinguished floor manager of the bill does not intend to take up too much time on the pending amendment.

I think the pending amendment is very important. Yesterday, when I was discussing the amendment with a few people, I was told that this is perhaps as important an amendment as we will face, on this bill because it is a matter of principle as to which direction, the Office of Economic Opportunity, is going to go.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I agree completely with what the Senator from Colorado says. However, I suggest that this is a very important amendment and that we allow 1 hour on each side. That will bring a vote on at about 4 o'clock. I should think that the Senator would agree that if any amendments are to be presented to the amendment, these should be germane, and that an amendment to the amendment perhaps should receive 10 minutes to each side.

Mr. DOMINICK. I hope that we can get through even sooner than that. I do not know of any amendments to the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Neither do I. However, with 100 prima donnas, one never knows what will happen in that regard.

My view would be that we could yield back at the end of the debate the time that had not been consumed. However, I should like to have an hour in the event that I might need it.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I would make one request in connection with that, and that is that we could have a live quorum approximately 20 minutes before the vote so that each of us could

have 10 minutes to explain the amendment to the Senators when they arrive here.

It does get a little exasperating to talk on a subject when not very many Senators are present in the Chamber.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it appears that it is impossible to arrive at a unanimous-consent agreement. I suggest that the Senator from Colorado proceed with the debate on his amendment.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 342

Mr. DOMINICK. It is my guess that we might get through with the debate on the pending amendment sooner if we could go along in the normal course of events than if we thought we had to consume a certain amount of time. So I will proceed with the debate on the pending amendment.

The purpose of the amendment is to take the Headstart program, which is presently being operated by the Office of Economic Opportunity, and transfer it, not this year, but in the next fiscal year, to the Office of Education.

I use the phraseology "the next fiscal year" on purpose.

As of a couple of years ago, many of our colleagues said that all the education programs should be transferred into the Office of Education, regardless of what agency was running the program. As a part of that policy, in 1966 we transferred the work study program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education, along with the adult education.

I offered an amendment at that time to accomplish the same thing with Headstart. Almost all of the witnesses that came before the Education Subcommittee agreed that this was a good thought, but they also said that from the administration point of view, they were not sure the time was right and that we ought to wait a year.

Later is now, and a year later from then is now. Therefore, on the basis of the testimony in 1966, we could probably legitimately make a case for transferring Headstart immediately. However, I have had some people talk to me about this problem, both fellow Senators and people from the Office of Education. They felt that in some areas of the country, at least, perhaps the school systems were not equipped to be able to carry out this provision immediately and that therefore an immediate transfer would not be as orderly as we would like.

As a result, I took that into consideration and modified my original amendment and prepared the pending amendment, No. 342, which provides that this transfer will become effective in the fiscal year 1969, and not in the fiscal year 1968.

That would give us time to coordinate a program. It would give us time to determine how we will continue.

Perhaps some details in connection



with this would be helpful, at least for the record. Under the present setup of the poverty program that is presently being considered, Headstart is lumped, along with other community action programs, into an overall authorization in title II.

This was true in fiscal year 1966. In fiscal year 1967, the committee specifically earmarked Headstart so that it could not be cut out by the community action planners and so that it could not be cut out in favor of other programs because it was the feeling of the committee that this is an excellent program, a program that deserves support.

This year the earmarking of funds was eliminated and Headstart was once again lumped in with the other community action programs to compete for funds at the will of the bureaucrats.

I have no concern that Headstart will be thoroughly abandoned, I want to say, but I do think we ought to be able to know what amount of money will be used for it, so that those involved can make plans based on the funds authorized.

We do not have any such provision in the pending bill. My amendment, to the contrary, would provide that if we transferred Headstart over to the Office of Education, we would have in the first fiscal year that this would be authorized—namely, in fiscal year 1969—\$375 million available for Headstart.

We have authorized a 2-year program. For the fiscal year 1970, we have requested an authorization of \$400 million.

I think these are reasonable projections. They are authorizations only. They are not appropriations. However, they do give some idea of the scope and extent to which I, at least, believe that the Headstart program should go.

It is interesting to note in this connection that although title I of the present bill provides for authorizations for the respective titles in it for fiscal year 1968, and although this also covers fiscal year 1969, the 1969 authorization is completely open-ended in the present bill. This is so despite my objection, because over and over again I have taken the position, before every committee on which I have served, that if we are to have authorizations, we must have an amount in the bill, and not just back door, open-Treasury spending simply because nobody wants to go to the bother of determining how much money they will have in a particular bill.

I wish to re-emphasize, Mr. President, that this amendment, if adopted, is designed simply to transfer from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education the specific program known as Headstart. It will take with it the people, the facilities, the ideas, the entire program that is now being operated by a sort of two-headed monster, into one organization where you can get administrative leadership and where you can put it together with the needed coordination so that it will fit into the educational system of our country.

I believe most of us would agree that Headstart, by and large, has been a pretty successful program. The interesting fact is that—if you look through the records and if you talk with the people who have been connected with it—when it has

been most successful, it has been operated within the structure of the public school system. This is where it has been most successful. The objections that have come and the faults that have been evidenced in the Headstart program have been in the process of coordination between the Headstart program and the elementary schools. It is this lack of coordination which, in fact, has led to the committee adding to the present bill a new project which is designed to go into the school systems and assist children who have been in Headstart. The new project is called Follow-Through.

In my judgment, the public as a whole has a very high regard for the Headstart program. As I have said, the one major criticism has been the lack of coordination. This has been on the minds of both the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Education; and during the past summer, the two departments got together and jointly announced grants totaling approximately \$2.5 million to 30 school districts, in order to follow through on the gains which have already been made in the Headstart program.

So, once again, here you are with a sort of two-headed monster, trying to administer one type of program and interjecting itself further and further into our school system.

I, for one, am convinced that one of the problems that we have in the bill now before the Senate is the interjection of the poverty people into the school system. It seems perfectly apparent to me, from reading the bill—I believe anyone who analyzes it carefully will come to the same conclusion—that with the Headstart program and then with the Followthrough program, what you are doing is taking the poverty people, who are operating at that level, and interjecting them directly into the public school systems.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I wonder if the Senator knows that at the outset of this program, in the State of California—this I consider one of the original causes of the problems for the entire program—the representatives who visited California went to the State superintendent of education and very carefully but forcefully explained that this program and any other programs funded with Federal moneys were to be handled by the representative of the OEO, and that the State superintendent of education would have no concern and have nothing to do with the use of these Federal funds, thereby creating an almost unworkable situation at the very outset.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am appreciative of the Senator's contribution. This is the problem that I believe is evident when we speak at the local level of the problems that Headstart and the school system are having with the poverty people. I believe the Senator's example is a graphic one.

I could go on and on with respect to this subject. However, instead of continuing at length, I shall just comment briefly with respect to the manner in which the program would be adminis-

tered and the people who are supporting the idea.

First of all, the money involved in the Headstart program, if transferred to the Office of Education, would be programmed through the State school agencies. It is not so programmed at this time. This, therefore, would put it right into the State agencies, who would determine which programs were going to continue, to what extent they were going to continue, and where the actual needs are. The people most intimately connected with the school system, the educational process of our young people, would therefore, State by State, be in charge of this program.

Second, the division of money among the States would be handled with exactly the same formula as it is handled now, with one exception. At the present time, the Director of the Poverty War has the right to allocate 20 percent of the total funds in any direction he wishes. I have cut the 20 percent down to 10 percent, recognizing that in some States or in particular areas of some States there may be a need for a little more money. It does not seem to me, however, that the Director of the poverty program or the Commissioner of Education should have unlimited discretion as to what to do with 20 percent of the total funds that are to be authorized and finally appropriated.

So I have cut that amount to 10 percent. Even this sum, it seems to me, would give them a substantial amount of flexibility. This in fact amounts, on the projection, to \$37.5 million, which is a large amount of money to put into the hands of one man to spend wherever he feels it is advisable; and in 1970, it would be some \$40 million.

I believe this is important. In other words, it would redirect the effort, through the Commissioner of Education, into the State agencies, which can then work with the people in the programs to maintain those programs that are operating, and to initiate them in conjunction with our school efforts and our educational efforts.

The next matter I wish to point out for the purpose of the record is the groups which have endorsed this idea.

We have had rather extensive hearings on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Subcommittee on Education, of which I am a member and of which the distinguished Senator from Vermont is the ranking minority member.

The groups which testified on their bill were asked by me or others on the committee whether they endorsed this type of transfer from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education. Those who endorsed the proposal were: Council of Chief State School Officers. These persons are chiefs of the educational processes in the States. They said yes, this should be done. The next organization was Great Cities for School Improvement.

The next organization is the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. The PTA is probably as well known in this country as any organization that I can think of. The next organization is the

National Association of State Boards of Education. They said they were delighted. They said, "Yes; this is what we would like; that is where it should be. We do not know why it has not been done up to this time."

The next organization was the National Association of State School Boards. The State school boards said, "We are involved in this matter day in and day out in district after district all over the country and the problem we run into is lack of cooperation between the poverty worker and the school system. If we can get the matter under the Office of Education we will have solved that problem."

We have gotten in touch with the National Education Association. They have expressed support for the amendment.

Mr. President, all organizations intimately connected with this matter are in favor of my amendment. I shall repeat the organizations. The list includes: the Council of Chief State School Officers, the Great Cities for School Improvement, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the National Association of State Boards of Education, the National Association of State School Boards. In addition, the National Education Association has also expressed support.

Mr. President, I wish to make the RECORD crystal clear on this matter. I would not want it said that I am trying to mislead anyone. No organization has actually reviewed this particular amendment, but they have endorsed the concept of the transfer.

I cannot see anything in the amendment which would jeopardize the program. I would simply move the program and give it more money and give the States more control over the program.

For those reasons it seems to me that the amendment is well worthwhile.

Mr. President, I shall reserve the remainder of my remarks for a later time when I shall request a live quorum before the vote is taken on this proposal.

(At this point, Mr. HOLLINGS assumed the chair.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Colorado as a cosponsor of this amendment. I congratulate the Senator upon his presentation and on the thorough and most convincing explanation he has made. I believe nothing would be left in doubt as to whether the adoption of the amendment is for the overall general good of the entire program.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his support of the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Colorado for a most constructive and objective approach to this question. I think it is a long step in the right direction. I am glad that so far as Headstart is concerned he has delayed action for a year to make it possible for the school systems to be fully prepared to undertake this responsibility.

I might say that I have some reserva-

tions with respect to some of the provisions in the amendment. However, I think these are not too serious and if my fears are justified this matter can be worked out in conference.

I assure the Senator of my support.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I appreciate the support of the Senator from Vermont, who is the ranking minority Member on the Subcommittee on Education. His support is important to the amendment.

I was delighted to be able to discuss with the Senator from Vermont and with the staff some of the original problems we had to work out in connection with this matter. The Senator from Vermont has been most helpful in the presentation and development of the program.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may deliver a few brief remarks on this matter which I have prepared?

Mr. DOMINICK. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, as a co-author of this amendment, I strongly urge its adoption. Headstart is one program to which we can all point with pride. I have received letters and heard testimony from educators, interested citizens and parents, all attesting to the importance and the success of Headstart. Yet, even Headstart has not been without problems. Most of these problems in my judgment, can be traced to the administration of the Headstart program. And, Mr. President, this year, as the Members well know, the Office of Economic Opportunity is proposing a pilot Follow Through program. Follow Through is based on studies which seem to indicate that the "gains" made by the Headstart graduate may be "lost" unless some of the attributes of the Headstart program are continued in the early elementary school years. This raises a very serious question. Administration on the Follow Through program by the Office of Economic Opportunity may result in OEO forcing itself into the school systems across the country.

Almost every educational and manpower expert in the country has called attention to the duplication, confusion and conflict that presently exists in Federal manpower and education programs. Yet for the most part we, the Congress, and the executive branch have done nothing to unscramble the mess, to put together the pieces of the puzzle in a manner that will assure maximum coordination and program effectiveness and efficiency.

Headstart is an education program. Presently Headstart is funded both under the poverty program and under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. With both the Office of Education and the Office of Economic Opportunity administering Headstart programs, needless duplication, double paperwork, and conflicting regulations must result. This cannot be permitted to continue.

Oh, Mr. President, I have listened to the arguments made by the Office of Economic Opportunity against the transfer of the Headstart program to the Office of Education. Stripping away the typical OEO rhetoric, their opposition

boils down to the reluctance on the part of one bureaucracy to lose a program and particularly the funds to another bureaucracy. The Office of Economic Opportunity contends that the transfer of Headstart to the Office of Education would result in "more of the same." The implication is that the Office of Education would not be able to administer the program as effectively as the Office of Economic Opportunity. Well, Mr. President, I have listened since 1965 to the Office of Economic Opportunity's presentation to the Poverty Subcommittee, and I submit the record fails to disclose that the Office of Economic Opportunity possesses administrative ability superior to any other agency. Program administration has not been one of the shining attributes of the Office of Economic Opportunity. In examining the record of the Office of Economic Opportunity, one finds a record replete with administrative difficulties. The record shows that some of the most elementary administrative changes have come along only as a result of congressional prodding.

Mr. President, the Congress of the United States has given the Office of Education the responsibility of administering education programs. The Office of Education administers title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which provides Federal assistance aimed at improving the education of various poor and disadvantaged youngsters. If we cannot trust the Office of Education to administer education programs, such as Headstart, if to transfer the Headstart program to the Office of Education will produce "more of the same," then I submit we had better do something about the Office of Education. When we have a Federal agency assigned the responsibility of education, then those programs involving education should be administered by that agency. If the agency fails to carry out its responsibility, then the agency should be required to "shape up." If it fails to shape up, then its head should be removed, or maybe the entire agency should be replaced. Certainly, however, the answer is not to create another agency to carry out the same responsibilities and to duplicate its functions. Layer after layer, whether horizontal or vertical, of Federal bureaucracies is not conducive to efficiency and to effective programs.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I am very much impressed with the astute observations now being made by the distinguished Senator from California, and with the remarks earlier of the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK].

During the years I was Governor of Wyoming, I had occasion to visit the Headstart operations in my State. I subscribe to the idea that is behind Headstart. I am aware, of course, of the accomplishments being made by that program.

I am in complete support of the amendment. I think there are a number of good reasons which have already been



touched upon, and I only wish now to reemphasize them.

First, I think that, as is true with so many Federal programs, there has been a proliferation of activities among the various agencies so as to bring about a serious overlapping of management, direction, and administration—all of which add to the cost of the programs.

The facilities used in most Headstart programs in my State are those under the administration and supervision of the various school districts which, I think, adds to the reason for placing this program under the Office of Education.

The efficacy of the Headstart programs will be increased as the program starts out with youngsters of preschool age. It seems reasonable to me that greater progress will be made as these youngsters start their kindergarten and go into the first grade.

I believe also that the continuity of instruction that would result from this change would be all to the good.

It is a good program. I think it can be a far better program if we do away with the duplication of expense that currently characterizes it, if we provide the continuity of direction and interest which will be afforded the program if transferred to the Office of Education, and if we see that the teachers can solve the problems of these youngsters before they ever set foot in a public school as members of the kindergarten or first-grade classes.

For these reasons, I commend the distinguished Senator from California and the distinguished Senator from Colorado for sponsoring this amendment.

It will improve what has proven to be one of the best parts of the poverty program. If we are going to reach these people, to help those youngsters who come from homes where parents have not been able to afford them the same opportunities as the children in homes having a normal income, then I say we must continue the program.

We certainly will strengthen it, in my opinion, if we place it where it should be; namely, in the Office of Education.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank my colleague from Wyoming.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I, too, wish to commend the distinguished Senator from California for his very able analysis of this problem and for the position which he takes, as well as the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Colorado.

I had the privilege of voting for the first authorization and the first appropriation for the Headstart program.

I believed, and believe now, that it is one of the finest programs which has been presented. I supported it wholeheartedly when it was first presented and have been unflinching in my support of the program.

I think that the approach of the amendment and the suggestions made by the Senators from California and Colorado are absolutely sound. The fact is, I find that in my State, many of the sessions of the Headstart program are held

during the summer and other vacation periods, when the teachers can readily be taken from the public school system. This has worked out very well although, perhaps, it is not the entire solution to the problem.

Certainly, in my opinion, the Senator is on the right track. He has very ably expressed the sentiments of many of us, and I again commend him and support his amendment.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire for his kind comments.

Mr. President, I, too, have the privilege of serving on both committees with my esteemed colleague from Colorado who, I assure you, Mr. President, deserves most of the credit for whatever we are about to accomplish here today. He has given a most complete delineation of the hearings and recitation of the evidence.

The Senate will recall that last year the Education Subcommittee recommended a transfer of the Headstart program to the Office of Education. We have heard witness after witness testify to the fact that they feel that the educators cannot only handle this program but can do it better than it is being done now. Typical of these statements was that of Superintendent Neil Sullivan of Berkeley, Calif. He endorsed the transfer in this manner:

Now I would strongly recommend that this committee consider taking the Head Start program and other educational programs out of the Office of Economic Opportunity and moving them over to the U.S. Office of Education, an Office equipped to handle the problems of education and not reestablishing a second organization in Washington and throughout the country that is not equipped to handle these problems.

This transfer was not done last year although we, the Congress, did transfer from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education the adult education program. Since that transfer, I have heard no statements suggesting that the Office of Education has not been able to administer the adult education program. I have heard, however, that there has been a better administration of the adult basic education program. I think it is safe to assume, then, that the Office of Education can do a better job. I am old fashioned, Mr. President. I think if your tooth aches, you should go to a dentist. If your car breaks down, you go to a mechanic. And if your pipes leak, you get a plumber.

Mr. President, since we are dealing with taxpayers' dollars and have the responsibility to make certain that these hard-earned dollars are used and spent properly, it becomes necessary for us to bring about an end to the confusion and needless duplication; we must see to it that States be required to deal with only one agency on one particular program. In the area of education, that agency is the Office of Education and it should be assigned the job of administering the Headstart program.

The time for the transfer is now. We cannot afford to delay any longer having a program administered by the second-best agency. We, therefore, should transfer the Headstart program to the Office of Education. This transfer will not only assure the successful continu-

ance of the Headstart program, but it will be more likely to bring about a better followthrough in the elementary and secondary grades.

Mr. President, I know that OEO will contend that there has been the greatest of cooperation between the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Office of Education. Unfortunately, I have not found this to be the case. Cooperation has given way to competition. Competition has resulted in needless delays, conflicting regulations and confusion among applicants for Headstart grants. A famous American once said:

The interest of childhood and youth are the interest of mankind.

I believe it is unfortunate when the interests of a bureaucracy prevent the Headstart program from being handled by the best qualified agency. It would be my purpose and desire to see that the interests of the children are served rather than the competition between two agencies.

Another reason for the transfer is to guarantee that Headstart program will be researched and its shortcomings altered. Anyone who has listened to the "snow job" that is annually given to the poverty committee by the Office of Economic Opportunity is greatly aware of the deficiencies in the Office of Economic Opportunity's evaluation system.

True, the Office of Economic Opportunity always says that by next year the data requested will be supplied; by next year the program will be better; and by next year all the wrongs will be righted. I, however, reply only that we have an old Mexican expression for that. They call it "manana." I think we have listened to "manana" long enough. I believe it is imperative that we conduct long term research on Project Headstart, that education programs be coordinated, and I am convinced that the Office of Education is the agency which is best equipped to administer the Headstart program.

I believe it is imperative that we continue this most successful program, Headstart, and that as it continues, we conduct long term research on the project to make certain that all possible improvements are being made. And I am further convinced, Mr. President, that the Office of Education is the proper agency which is best equipped and is properly constituted to administer the Headstart program and follow through with these youngsters in the elementary and secondary schools. In this way, we will be certain that we are initiating education in the proper manner and that the same agency will be charged with properly following through with these same youngsters.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to express my appreciation for the excellent statement which the Senator from California has just made. I think he highlights the problem with which we are faced—that is, competition between two agencies in Washington and the interjection of a really new agency into the school system, and the educational process.

The question is whether we are to continue that educational program in

the wrong agency simply because we do not want to hurt anybody's feelings.

It is for these reasons that the Senator from Arizona, the Senator from California, and I have coordinated our efforts.

I think the Senator has done an excellent job in highlighting the issues. I appreciate his support.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, it is a great honor to be a cosponsor of the amendment of the Senator from Colorado. I think the suspicion of this necessity has existed in both committees. I think as the Senator and I heard both sides of the question and heard the witnesses, we were possibly more conscious of it and more sensitive than perhaps the general membership of this distinguished body. An indication that the change was suggested earlier is proof enough that now is the time that it be done, because I absolutely and truly believe that it would be of greater benefit to the children served by these several programs.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope this amendment to transfer Headstart to the Office of Education will not be adopted by the Senate, even though the Senator from Colorado has postponed the effective date of the transfer until 1969.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted. It may well be, in due course, that Headstart could be transferred to the Office of Education, but I say again, as I said last year, the time has not yet come. I want to buttress that statement. In the first place, Headstart is not primarily an educational program. It is a comprehensive child development program, which includes, in addition to the educational component, medical and dental services, nutritional services, social services, and parental involvement.

It may be argued—in fact, it was argued—by the Senator from Colorado that the ordinary school system can furnish adequate medical and dental services, such as the school lunch program, in many schools, and I guess most schools. There are guiding and counseling facilities in most schools today, and there are PTA's, as the Senator has said. But I believe anyone who has made a study in depth of how Headstart operates would be inclined to agree that the Office of Economic Opportunity has brought into being a new and imaginative institution which goes far beyond the kind of care these little children would receive if they were forced into the average public school system.

I have seen these programs, particularly in the South, where the racial problem is still quite acute in the educational field. I can assure my colleagues that it would be a disaster to turn the Headstart program over to what is in fact, if not in name, in many school districts in the South, a thoroughly segregated educational system. The school boards are not ready for it. They do not want it. The teachers would resent the imposition of the load. And I would predict that to transfer this program to the Office of Education, and through it to the average school board in the South, would come pretty close to wrecking the program if it were done now, or even in 1969.

I see the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke] in the Chamber. I noted

that in Boston yesterday a lady—no doubt an estimable lady—got more votes than anybody else for mayor of Boston in the nonpartisan primary. She ran on a program that she did not want to see any Negro children bused into white schools, which would create an integrated situation. I am concerned about the Headstart program if that lady is elected mayor of Boston, as I understand she is very likely to be. I think we would throw into a northern city, where there is de facto segregation because of the housing pattern, another explosive situation where the Headstart program and the little children in it would be the innocent victims of an administrative shift, which, to my way of thinking, is very hard to justify, in the immediate future.

I know in my own cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, and in other cities in the Commonwealth also, we have that same segregated pattern of housing. I deplore it. My former comrade in arms, Mr. Dilworth, who is now chairman of the Philadelphia School Board, says his most serious problem is to make some progress in raising the level of the educational effort in the largely Negro and Puerto Rican schools of the Philadelphia ghetto.

They are having trouble getting teachers; they are having trouble building enough schools; they are having all kinds of trouble with programs. They are having trouble with parents and with the PTA. I would hate to throw on that already overburdened school system the additional burden of the Headstart program.

I would point out, with all the emphasis I can command, that I do not believe that school systems in the North or in the South, in many instances, are presently capable of taking on a Headstart program, running it successfully, and preventing this really meaningful and successful experiment from being killed in the process.

As my second point, I think it is also clear that Headstart is a community action activity, and relies heavily on the services provided by other parts of the total community action program. That is spelled out in some detail on pages 2833 to 2844 of part 9 of the hearings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those pages of the hearings be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearings was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator CLARK. Well, I think that pretty well covers our overview of the community action programs. Now I believe we can get down to the specific programs. Mr. Shriver, I understand that you would like to deal with Headstart for a while which, at least where I sit, is probably the most congressionally successful program. I don't think you need to spend too much time on it but we ought to make a record concerning Headstart. I think you should follow through in something which needs more treatment than Headstart, but you do it your own way.

Mr. SHRIVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Next to me is Jule Sugarman, who is the Associate Director of Headstart and has been since the start of the program. One of the reasons that I feel that it would be worthwhile to spend some time on Headstart as distinguished from Followthrough is because of the opinion of some legislators that Headstart would be just as effective within the

Office of Education, let's say, as it is within community action. We have been attempting to explain our philosophy on this, at any rate, as to why Headstart is a great asset of community action and in fact is a community action program rather than a specific educational or health or other type program.

So in point of view of the record, anyway, we would like to have these aspects of Headstart emphasized.

Senator CLARK. That is right.

I would like to note for the record in the State of Mississippi you could not have any Headstart today. I think that is one specific instance where it is a good thing that Headstart is under OEO and certainly not under the local boards of education.

Mr. SHRIVER. I agree with that. It is not even limited to a special situation like that. Headstart has been very helpful to us at any rate, as a community action program in getting community action started, in getting people working together. Outside of the South there are people working together who never worked together before, were brought together because of their mutual interest in these children. From that has emanated a great many things to benefit community action.

Senator CLARK. See if I understand it. Your view is Headstart is not only an educational program for the young preschool children but it is also an educational program for the family involving health facilities and educational facilities for founding a good deal of other areas where in order to turn out a whole child you have to do something with the disadvantaged family. This is one reason why you don't believe that the Office of Education is as well qualified to deal with it as the Office of Economic Opportunity?

Mr. SHRIVER. As CAP. For example, one could suggest that the whole CAP operation just be taken out of OEO. What I am suggesting is that it be left in CAP because it has extremely fruitful connections in CAP. That is what I frankly would like to have Mr. Sugarman talk about. That is the reason we felt it is worth your attention.

Senator CLARK. I think you have a good point there. Let us know if you can develop this, to what extent Headstart programs are being operated across the country by local boards of education of a delegated basis.

#### STATEMENT OF JULE SUGARMAN, DIRECTOR, HEADSTART, OEO

Mr. SUGARMAN. I would be happy to do that, Senator. I might say we have Dr. Nolan Estes of the Office of Education with us and you may wish to ask him questions as well.

Mr. SHRIVER. This is Dr. Estes.

Senator CLARK. Happy to have you with us.

Mr. SUGARMAN. In response to your specific question, Mr. Clark, the proportion of programs varies between summer and full year. The summer programs now serve about 500,000 children. There are roughly two-thirds operated by public schools, 10 percent by private schools, and the remainder by private nonprofit agencies.

The full year programs are increasingly more popular and there is a growing interest in them on the part of the communities. There are now some 200,000 children enrolled. Less than one-third of the programs are operated by public school systems, about 10 percent by private school systems and the remainder by private nonprofit agencies, about 29 percent of them by community action agencies directly and about 26 percent by other private and nonprofit agencies.

Senator CLARK. Is that because the 4-year Headstart program can not find space in the public schools?

Mr. SUGARMAN. I think it is a little broader than space. I think they have space problems but I think the schools face numerous challenges and many of them feel they are not



ready to take on this kind of program at this time. There are parts of the country in which the interest does not really exist among educators for preschool programs and other parts of the community have sprung forth to take their place.

Senator CLARK. Do you have any criteria by which you could objectively measure the success to date of the Headstart program?

Mr. SUGARMAN. Yes, I think we do have a good deal of data, Senator, that is beginning to accumulate.

Let me just try to lay out for the committee a sort of consensus picture of what this data shows. There are wide ranges in what it shows with some internal contradictory evidence. However, in general, the research says the child who comes into Headstart is substantially below the advantaged child in his development. If you use a scale of 100, he is down somewhere around 80 or 85. After he has been in Headstart he is up to the 90-to-95 range. He is below the average child but still significantly better than when he came into the program.

Senator CLARK. Are you talking nationally?

Mr. SUGARMAN. Yes.

Senator CLARK. It must be a wide geographical variation.

Mr. SUGARMAN. Tremendous. You may find one child that tests at 150 and another tests at 60, but if you put all the figures together and try to extract a synthesis from them that is what you get.

It is particularly true that the child who was the worst off when he started is one who gains the most in the program and that is, interestingly enough, particularly true for boys. Boys seem to gain much more from Headstart than do girls.

After the child has been out of Headstart for a few months or a year he tends to lose some of the gains which he has achieved during the Headstart program, a fact which we attribute largely to the kind of program into which he goes in the school system, whether it be kindergarten or first grade. He does not slip back to his original level but he does not maintain the level of gain that he first achieved in the program.

Senator CLARK. Let me interrupt. I neglected to ask that the chart "Headstart Community Action Program" should be printed in the program beginning with your remarks.

Mr. SUGARMAN. Fine.

The material subsequently supplied follows:

"HEADSTART—A COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM"

"Volunteers."	
"New careers/teacher aides."	
"Parent involvement—100,000 as workers or volunteers."	
"Support of Community Action Agencies."	
"Tied to other CAP Family Programs."	
"Health, nutrition, psychological services, education, etc."	
"In FY 1968:	
"Children Served:	
Summer .....	520,000
Full Year .....	213,000
Follow-Through .....	190,000
Volunteers .....	125,000

"Programs established in 2,150 communities."

Mr. SUGARMAN. Beyond that the research shows that there are very substantial health problems among children in Headstart. In the dental care area there is an appalling degree of neglect and we have spent a good deal of effort and money in trying to correct some of our dental deficiencies.

Senator CLARK. If the program has received it from the Office of Education, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, it would not be possible to continue those dental services that are being proposed under OEO?

Dr. ESTES. It is possible. We do have some programs that provide these services; how-

ever, we would find it extremely difficult because of our emphasis on the educational component. If you look at the total amount spent in title I, we spent only 2.3 percent on health services, about 2.3 percent as compared to much larger amounts in Headstart, which shows the difference in the thrust between Headstart and title I.

Senator CLARK. But you are closer to the Office of Health than OEO is in the Offices of President. Why wouldn't you find it just as easy to walk across the aisle to talk to your health people?

Dr. ESTES. There are 44 agencies.

Mr. SHRIVER. Here is our favorite dentist.

Dr. ESTES. There are 44 agencies in Government.

Senator CLARK. Most of the dentists are over in the Department of Defense, aren't they?

Mr. SHRIVER. We have the best dentist.

Dr. ESTES. In the area of education, I would say we had a closer working relationship with OEO than we do with any of the agencies which are within our own department or in the other departments of Government.

Senator CLARK. It does not make sense administratively, does it? I mean it really does not. There is Secretary Gardner sitting up over HEW and you tell me you have closer relationships with OEO than you have with Health?

Dr. ESTES. I beg your pardon, sir. I didn't mean it that way. I said we had as good or better relationships with OEO as with other branches of Government.

Senator CLARK. Now let's get back to you, sir.

Mr. SUGARMAN. I was saying that the general health picture is one of having a large number of children with problems who in the course of an ordinary family will get attended to but in the history of these children have not been attended to. The rates of incidence of health problems are not terribly higher than in an advantaged home except in certain specific areas like anemia and parasitic infections and things of that sort. But on the other hand, if these problems continue to be neglected they become serious problems.

The other thing that I think we have been most encouraged about in our research and evaluation to date is the very substantial interest that parents are showing in the program and the fact that are beginning to participate not only in Headstart but as their children go on into the school system. We think this is terribly important for the whole effort that we are making here.

I might say that evaluation is a very difficult job from the technical point of view and we have spun a lot of wheels trying to find the best way to do this. We have now put the major thrust of our effort in 13 regional research and evaluation centers which are all university based which will give us an on-going capacity to try to search out answers to our problems and ways that we can move in the future.

I might refer to the chart on the wall here which has been inserted in the record, the chart headed "Headstart and Community Action Program," and talk about what Mr. Shriver had to say. I have a fondness for saying that Headstart is community action from the ground up, community action in the sense that when a Headstart program operates well it does all the things on a small scale that the community action agencies ought to do on a large scale. It involves the parents in decisionmaking. It relates professionals to parents in constructive ways and gives both a sense of really working together. It provides very substantial career opportunities for persons from the target areas.

Incidentally, I think we are making great progress in employing nonprofessionals and that again is having an impact on the school systems. For example, in the city of Cincinnati there have been nonprofessional aids in the schools system in Cincinnati for a num-

ber of years. But traditionally they have been relegated to relatively minor roles, putting away papers and hanging up wraps and things of that sort. When the nonprofessionals were introduced into the Headstart program and the school system, which was running the Headstart program, say what could be done with them, they began to change their whole approach to the nonprofessionals in the school system.

We have had just a fantastic amount of volunteer effort in support of the Headstart program and it is our belief that for every hour of paid employment that OEO has financed in the Headstart program there has been an equivalent time of volunteer time given by people in the local communities. I had really expected there would be some fall off in the amount of volunteer effort as the program grew older but that does not seem to be the case thus far and most communities report they have all the volunteers that want to help in the program.

Headstart is, of course, a comprehensive program in the kinds of services that it offers to the child and his family. I think one of the things we are learning a great deal about in this program which has relevance to the Follow Through program as well is how the educators and the social workers and the doctors and the nurses and the nutritionists and the psychologists can all work as a team together with the parent, the director, and the nonprofessionals.

Senator CLARK. I think you make a good case for the kind of program that Headstart is or that you hope it will become, but I am going to have to meet it on the floor of the Senate for the argument.

That is all very well but why can't that be done just as well under the supervision in the Office of Education? Why can't it?

Mr. SUGARMAN. Well, I think that the answer really is one that Mr. Shriver has suggested. It is not which agency runs the program but its integral relationship to other parts of the community action effort.

As Mr. Shriver has suggested, there are literally hundreds of communities which have Headstart as the primary program for their community action agency. If they were excluded from the operation of the Headstart program, then it is very likely that they could go out of existence or lose the forward thrust that they have thus far.

Second, OEO has a tradition and experience of dealing a little bit differently with communities than does the Office of Education.

As you know, we do not channel programs through State education agencies, for example, or through any other State departments, but rather work directly with local agencies. We do have the experience and the policy of setting certain kinds of quality standards and of imposing upon communities certain requirements in order for programs to be funded. This tends to be less true in the Office of Education.

But basically it is this continuing dialog which ought to exist between the community action agency and the Headstart program that we see as fundamental to the maintenance in OEO.

Senator CLARK. Is that about all you need to say about Headstart?

Mr. SUGARMAN. I think so, unless you would like to proceed to Followthrough.

Senator CLARK. It seems to me, Mr. Shriver, this is as good a time as any to get you on the record on what is one of the knottiest problems which confronts us, which is whether it would not be better to have OEO shed all of its operating responsibilities and become a planning organization with real coordinative authority. What I mean by real coordinative authority, have the OEO given the same status as the President himself delegating to you as the head of OEO the job of coordinating the activities for all the other departments in the name of the President.

Many of the professional administrators

tell us if you cannot have satisfaction on the line service that you will be better off if you were doing the overall planning and also the direction of priorities and the setting of standards as opposed to the action of the operation of these various programs. I think we ought to have on the record a response from you to that suggestion because we are certain to have to meet on the floor.

Mr. SHRIVER. I think that the answer lies more in the factual situation than it does in political theory. I think that the personalities involved, the length of time during which an agency has been in existence, what the President wants, since he is the Chief Executive, are considerations more important than the theory. Theoretically one could say that the observations you have just made coincide with the public administration policy. My own impression, however, is that Presidents don't always necessarily follow exactly what Woodrow Wilson's school thinks best. Consequently, I don't think that it is very helpful in a practical situation to discuss what the theoretically most desirable solution is from a practical point of view.

Senator CLARK. I am not at all sure I could sell this present setup on the theory that that is what the President wants. It may be all right for me, it is certainly all right for you, but I am not sure that is going to go down with the Congress.

Mr. SHRIVER. I am not sure it is, either. All I am trying to say is that his title is Chief Executive, among other titles, and that it is his decision as to how the thing should be established, which means, in the final analysis, the executive branch decides the issue.

Now, as a matter of fact, these alternative ways of organizing or separating these functions have been considered at great length over a period of at least 3 years by the President and the current configuration is the one he likes, I am not saying necessarily it is worthy of a Ph. D.; on the other hand, it is what he prefers. I don't think pragmatically it has failed to work. I think it has worked for the most part except that I do agree with some people who have said that its coordinating authority should be increased. We have attempted to do this, at least to a modest extent, in the current bill that we have presented to the Congress.

Senator CLARK. But you don't really change that situation. You are the coordinator of the whole war on poverty under the old law and proposal No. 2 but you still don't have any authority to tell Cabinet officers what to do. Unless and until you get that authority I don't think the coordinating is apt to be terribly effective, do you?

Mr. SHRIVER. But there is only one person in the Government who has the authority to tell his own Cabinet what to do.

Senator CLARK. That is why I was making the suggestion that you be given the right to speak in the name of the President, which you don't presently have.

Mr. SHRIVER. All the people who have special authority to be of assistance to these people normally have the right to speak in the name of the President, but it is obvious to some individuals that some people seem to have more authority for the President to speak than others in an adjoining office. So it is not a question of a title and it is not a question of a legal thing because I believe that no law could be drawn which would automatically force the President to delegate a particular part of his power to somebody regardless of who it is. It is not a question, therefore, of the title; it is a question of the actual operations.

Senator CLARK. One of our staff studies recommends that the President should be the Chairman of the Economic Opportunity Council and as Chairman would have the right to delegate anybody he wanted to—the Vice President, you, anybody else—the power to speak in his name and that in this way you could get authority to coordinate as

opposed to merely permissive coordination as at present. What do you think of that?

Mr. SHRIVER. I think it would be safe for anybody to think that the President has considered that and for reasons best known to himself perhaps he has up until now decided against that.

Senator CLARK. But one of the problems is that maybe that Congress makes this decision.

Mr. SHRIVER. I am not saying that it is a wrong decision or that Congress cannot make it. All I was trying to observe was that the President has had that thought go through his mind, I think.

Senator CLARK. But I want you to tell us why you don't think it would be wise for the Congress to do it.

Mr. SHRIVER. I think in the final analysis the President is either going to make it work or not and we have had experience, I think, in this country of Congress actually setting up a power and then the Chief Executive or other branches of the executive not using the power. This is not because it is unlawful but because it is the way a particular man in that office there wants to operate. So we have come forward, Mr. Chairman, with at least one modest improvement in the coordinating authority involved which is merely to establish a permanent staff for the Economic Opportunity Council whose singular purpose would be to operate to bring problems up to the level of the Council in a manner where they could be resolved there, and if they are not resolved there then they could be moved higher.

Up until now our agency itself has had to supply the staff for the Economic Opportunity Council and they have had six or seven additional jobs. The result is that the staff work for the Economic Opportunity Council has not been as good as it should have been. Issues do not get crystallized and brought to the Economic Opportunity Council in an actionable form.

I personally believe it would be a substantial step in the direction Congress appears to want to go. At least this line of questions appears that you might want to go in that direction if we—

Senator CLARK. No. I think we ought to make a record.

Mr. SHRIVER. I hope I am making a helpful record. Dr. Levine just sent me a note with the observation on it that the power of agencies, like the Bureau of the Budget itself and of the National Security Council itself, varies greatly between different Presidential administrations. Sometimes the Bureau of the Budget has a great deal of power, sometimes it does not; sometimes the National Security Council does and sometimes it does not, even though the law is not changed in the process.

Senator CLARK. I think this is true. One of the things that disturbs me is that at the moment the Bureau of the Budget through its fiscal powers and budgetary powers is able to exercise power direction over the poverty programs, which I don't believe they should. If you had this opportunity council with a little bit of power then I would think you might have a countermand of power of the Bureau of the Budget which would be very useful.

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, it has been suggested in hearings before this committee previously that the device be adopted, such as a national antipoverty budget, which you might call a subsidiary part of the regular budget and which would give this agency a great deal more control over the poverty program than now exists.

The fact is that as it now operates it is very much like, if not identical to, other aspects of the budget; namely, that the President in the final analysis is the budget officer who makes the allocation.

Senator CLARK. This is true, but the budget deals primarily with dollars and you deal primarily with people. My objection is that

here is an agency which deals almost entirely with dollars, balancing one, balancing the budget, and they should not be making these decisions, it does not seem to me, except to the extent that the President pulls the string on them and says so much money and no more.

Mr. SHRIVER. Let me say for the record, since I am looking at the picture as a whole, that the Bureau of the Budget works very closely in cooperation with us and has not restricted itself or shouldn't, in my judgment, merely to balancing the budget by working around with figures. They have an extremely able staff, a staff which has been very helpful to us, and which addresses itself to substantive matters in addition to money matters. It certainly has been a constructive force rather than an opposition force with respect to OEO.

Senator CLARK. Now let's get back to this staff you are recommending. What would be the size of the staff and what would be the appropriation you think they would need for salaries and other expenses to operate?

Mr. SHRIVER. The actual size of staff has not been worked out in final detail but our thoughts were somewhat along this line; that the senior staff person would be at the highest career civil service level, which is GS-3. That would be deputy GS-16 and perhaps as many as three or four additional officers plus the clerical assistants and stenographic assistants to make them effective. So we would be talking about a total officer complement, to use that phrase, of maybe eight people supplemented with appropriate space and clerical assistance.

Senator CLARK. You have them physically located in your building as opposed to in the White House?

Mr. SHRIVER. Frankly, we have not come to that issue. It is not so much a question, I believe, of where they are physically located, such as space problems in the executive branch, but more a question of their relationship to the White House rather than where they are physically located.

Mr. LEVINE. Mr. Chairman, could I add something? As I understand, your original question, it was substitution of such a staff for an independently funded OEO. I would like to add something on the other part of the question, on the need for independent funding of OEO's own program. I think the EOC staff we are requesting is an excellent idea if added to the independent funding of OEO programs.

In looking at this I think it depends on what kind of theory you take. If you take bureaucratic theory you look for a nice organization chart. If you look at the theory of bargaining, however, I think the answer to why OEO comes out fairly clearly, you need an independent national agency, and particularly independent local agencies like community action authorities, under the supervision of this independent national agency as bargainers with and for the poor, that this works only with some independent programs.

Coordination of Cabinet officers is a nice idea, but unless you can do the kinds of things we have been doing like innovating, coordination at the local level, I am talking primarily at the local level, and occasionally, say in places like Mississippi, offering some rivalry to existing organizations, I think the whole poverty effort becomes much less effective politically than the existing bureaucracies of various sorts. It is very important to have an independent agency and I think it is important to have a director of this agency reporting to the President.

Senator CLARK. What you are saying, in effect, is that the administrative or political science theory, if you can't be both staff and line, is just not right that you can plan and operate, too. That is what you are saying, isn't it?

Mr. LEVINE. Yes, sir. I think that is right.

Mr. SHRIVER. Could I add a point there?

Senator CLARK. Surely.



Mr. SHRIVER. The Federal Information Service that we have is an extremely helpful tool both to the agency and to OEO's coordinating role. In other words, under that authority to gather information we have, in a sense, the intelligence arm of this war and until we get more intelligence we are not going to be able to prosecute the total war in the future as ably as we can. That is an extremely important aspect of our total job. It gets very little attention over here and I wanted to mention it for the record because it is very important.

Senator CLARK. You certainly could still keep your intelligence services, every staff agency has its own intelligence service serving its commanders.

Mr. SHRIVER. Excuse me. What I was talking about was the Federal Information Service which covers the whole domestic budget. I think it is now about \$60 billion worth of expenditures by the Federal Government on the domestic side, which are now being processed through the Federal Information Service. That is the first comprehensive view of the totality of the Federal Government's action domestically in the United States, leaving out the Department of Defense. Everything else is there.

Senator CLARK. Well, to whom does the Federal Information Service report?

Mr. SHRIVER. To us.

Senator CLARK. OEO?

Mr. SHRIVER. That is right. It effectively helps us to look for gaps and the necessity of or lack of necessity for new programs, but it is also very helpful to this economic program. In fact, it was because of the Federal Information Service or system that we were able to collect for the first time exactly what was going on or not going on in a State like Mississippi, so that 18 months ago in January 1966 we inaugurated a program of special concentration on Mississippi. That was made possible because we gathered together everything that we were doing and what we were not doing and then took some specific steps.

Senator CLARK. Now that you brought that up, I think we ought to have a little more in the record about it. How many people are employed by the Federal Information Service and what is its budget? If you have not got it, could you furnish it for the record?

Mr. SHRIVER. I should have. Just a minute. Could you get it for the record?

Bob Cassidy is the Assistant of OEO for Management.

Mr. CASSIDY. I don't have it.

Mr. SHRIVER. I just goofed.

Senator CLARK. Let me call your attention to your own congressional presentation which has one—

Mr. SHRIVER. Thank you.

Senator CLARK. It looks like a two-page summary called "The Federal Information System," which I would like to have printed in the record at this point.

The document referred to follows:

#### "THE FEDERAL INFORMATION SYSTEM"

"The vast resources of the Federal Government are administered through a variety of programs managed by all Federal departments and agencies and operated in the states, counties and communities. Until recently, it was not possible to ascertain which of these programs was available for use in an area of interest, nor in fact was the amount of funds at work known even to those most closely associated with the area. Indeed, because of the complexities of Government it was not possible for even the granting agencies to determine the extent to which other Federal programs might be influencing the economy or satisfying the need of an area of interest.

"With full recognition of the implication of this committee, OEO undertook the compilation and production of a Catalog of Federal Programs for Individual and Community Improvement, a document which accom-

plished for the first time a merger under one cover of information on more than 260 programs funded by Federal Departments and Agencies. The universal acceptance and value of this document is attested by the large and continuing demand for it. More than 250,000 copies have now been printed and distribution is continuing at a steady pace. In the 1966 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act the Congress directed that OEO update and republish this document, incorporating the newer programs born of later legislation.

"Under the direction of the Economic Opportunity Council and with the aid of the Bureau of the Budget, the OEO Information Center set out early in 1966 to design and to develop a system which would collect operating program information covering the programs contained in the Catalog; process this information in a compatible format; and display it in a manner which would make it more generally useful. The results of this effort have been most rewarding and have led to the development of the Federal Information Exchange System.

"The Federal Information Exchange System, as the title implies, collects information from all Federal Departments and Agencies and develops a central data bank for use by all Federal, state, and local agencies as well as the private sector. At present over 160 programs, representing 16 agencies, are included in the system, and as the effort continues the data base is expanding. Information is currently available on programs funded at the county level, although in some instances the departments are having to revise their systems to report at the county level. Not all programs are reported at present in the depth of detail necessary for the ideal system. Publication of the first official reports from the system has evoked a sizeable amount of appreciation from the recipients and has in effect amplified the true nature of this effort—the concept of Information Exchange. The system is now capable of responding to requests for feedback of the information in many forms, and it is already being used for planning purposes.

"Already it is obvious that much more needs to be done to make this system even more useful and meaningful. A further development has been the compilation, production and publication of a complete set of socio-economic profiles covering every county in the United States. These profiles describe the social and economic characteristics of each county with appropriate indicators of the strengths and weaknesses and with numerous comparisons to national and state experience. Thus, it is now possible to identify the problems in each community.

"The next step, to be accomplished during FY 1968, is to blend these problem definitions with the previously published program information to determine shortfalls and overages. With this information, planners and budgeters can begin to redirect their programs to better satisfy the need and to produce greater return in the relief of suffering, misery and want.

"Another major effort now being undertaken will have major importance on the Federal Information Exchange System. This effort involves working closely with the State Governments to develop a system for making optimum use of the data available (or which could be available) within the State Departments. In some instances this may involve the design of entire collection and processing systems; in others only a redirection of present efforts may be needed to permit the States to make better use of their information.

"OEO is spearheading this effort in the belief that if the states have better information they can then do a better job of planning and budgeting. At the same time, information thus collected by the states can be shared or exchanged with the Federal Government and, to the extent appropriate, with other states. Present plans call for the

involvement of six states on a pilot test basis, with intent to assist the states in the installation of operational systems. Information which can be added to the federal data bank as a result of this effort will fill a major void. The extension of this plan to other states will greatly improve the responsiveness of the system and will enhance the Federal Government's information posture, providing in one place information hitherto unavailable from any source."

Senator CLARK. That does not give us either the staff or the dollar amount. If you could furnish that at a later date we would be grateful to you.

Mr. SHRIVER. I can make a guess. There are somewhere around 30 people there, at a cost of about \$2.7 million a year.

Senator CLARK. Well, if that turns out to be inaccurate, please correct the record.

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes; we will get it accurate. I just wanted to give an approximate idea what it was.

Senator CLARK. Now if we are going to follow out this staffing of the committee I was speaking about, the coordinating committee you were speaking about a few moments ago, we are going to have to get you some more supergrades, aren't we?

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes, sir; or they have to be assigned to somebody else and delegated to us.

Senator CLARK. Of course you know this is one of problems with the other body.

Mr. SHRIVER. What?

Senator CLARK. With the House. You know that horrible row we had last year about the supergrades.

Mr. SHRIVER. Excuse me. I was really wrong. They have 89 people there now. That shows you how things can grow.

Senator CLARK. Our books show 98.

Mr. SHRIVER. That is what is authorized, but they don't have them.

Senator CLARK. I see.

Mr. SHRIVER. Eighty-nine is what they have.

How much money?

Ninety people. They hired somebody yesterday, I guess.

Mr. LEVINE. Three and a half million dollars.

Mr. SHRIVER. Well, a little closer to that, \$3.5 million.

Senator CLARK. Mr. Patricelli, do you have a question?

Mr. PATRICELLI. Mr. Shriver, I understand this staff would report to you as Chairman of the Economic Opportunity Council. Is that correct?

Mr. SHRIVER. Yes, or to Congress. Whoever the Chairman would be.

Mr. PATRICELLI. Do you think it would be possible for a staff which is appointed by you and reports to you to develop alternatives on a Government-wide basis, alternatives that might delegate OEO programs to other departments and agencies? Could this staff function effectively in presenting options in the same way, for example, that the Bundy staff supposedly acted in presenting foreign policy options to the President?

Mr. SHRIVER. Theoretically, I think you are right. On the face of it it looks like a conflict of interest. In fact, however, it is true that our own staff, letting that theoretical staff alone for a minute, has developed proposals to us for spinoffs and delegations and we have done it without any pressure from anybody. I mean a letter of actual history that is actually what is happening. I am not saying that the conflict is not latent there; all I am trying to say is up to now it has not reared its ugly head.

Mr. PATRICELLI. Would you agree that the staff might be freer to present options and alternatives if it did not report to you as Director of OEO but to a higher level?

Mr. SHRIVER. Surely.

Senator CLARK. Mr. Shriver, the staff has prepared a memorandum with additional questions on Headstart which I will not take

time to have asked right now because I do want to move ahead. Our staff will furnish your people with these questions and perhaps you can provide answers.

Mr. SHRIVER. Be happy to.

Mr. CLARK. My third point is that the Headstart program is being operated in many of the schools at present. There is a wide area of flexibility given to the Office of Economic Opportunity, and, in point of fact, one-third of the full-year Headstart programs and two-thirds of the summer programs are presently being run by public school systems. This is being done on a delegation basis. The Office of Economic Opportunity can and often has delegated to school systems which it believes are competent and capable of handling the Headstart program the actual running of these programs for little children of 3, 4, and sometimes 5 years of age.

So the present flexible basis, I suggest, is far preferable to putting Headstart in a straitjacket and requiring it to be transferred to school systems, which, I say again, in many instances are not prepared to accept the responsibility with any reasonable hope of success.

My fourth point is that the Headstart programs are operated primarily by community action agencies directly, or their delegates, and should be. This is, as I said earlier, a typical community action activity which should be run at the grassroots level, by individuals primarily interested in the poverty program and not in the education of middle class and upper class youth—or even lower middle class youth, coming from families who could not conceivably be considered a part of the poverty population.

When you throw Headstart into the school systems, I suggest, too, you take all the emphasis on a successful attack on poverty out of the program, and you put it into the hands of individual administrators—principals, school teachers, doctors and dentists, if you like—whose concept of their obligation is to serve the children of the entire community, without regard to whether they are poor or not.

I think there is a need for advocacy for the children of the poor, which is the great contribution which OEO is able to make.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thought perhaps that rather than wait until the Senator is through, and then make a talk of my own, I could engage in a little colloquy with him at this point.

Mr. CLARK. I would be happy to.

Mr. DOMINICK. As to some points the Senator has raised which I think are of interest:

First of all, I would point out to the Senator that on page 4 of my amendment, we specifically provide, under section 6, that the State program, which would have to be approved by the Commissioner of Education, must provide "a balanced program to meet the educational, nutritional, health, clothing, and other unique needs of children from impoverished backgrounds in order for them to function at optimum levels in relationship to other children."

That is the exact wording, actually, in the poverty bill itself. What I am saying is that this is not educationally oriented; we are trying to approach the problem in the same way that they have already successfully done.

Mr. CLARK. I am aware of that, and I think if the Senator's amendment were to be adopted—which I hope it will not—that that is a useful provision.

I note, however, that the Senator from Colorado does not include any reference to the parents in that part of his amendment. I do not know whether he does anywhere else or not.

One of the major problems in connection with Headstart is to get the parents of these poor children to cooperate. As I said the other day, in many of their homes there has never been a book. In many of the homes, the knowledge of public health and sanitation is pretty rudimentary. Working with the parents is one of the major purposes in the Headstart program. It has been extraordinarily successful in most jurisdictions.

I do not think formal school systems could be expected to give that degree of concentrated attention to the parental needs of these children, if the program were incorporated into the average school system.

Mr. DOMINICK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. On page 7 of the amendment, under subsection (c), where we are talking about the question of where most of the plans are set up, I think we have taken care of most of the problems the Senator from Pennsylvania has brought up as to the question of whether or not the program could go forward in public school systems, because that subsection provides that if no satisfactory plan is submitted, or no acceptable plan, or no plan at all, then the Commissioner is authorized to go directly to the qualified community action board, or, in any community where there is no board, directly to the educational agencies.

That would permit the Commissioner to have considerable flexibility in those areas where there might otherwise be some problems. That is the purpose for including subsection (c). I was not sure whether the Senator from Pennsylvania had had an opportunity to analyze that subsection.

Mr. CLARK. Actually, I was aware of its existence, but I am happy to have the explanation of the Senator from Colorado.

I suppose this is as good a place as any to say that I am really most skeptical about this administrative scheme of State planning. I would suggest, without attempting to be invidious or to name States where I believe this to be true, that there will be a number of States where State Boards of Education not only would not supplement, with an adequate State plan, a Headstart program, but probably are adverse to the whole Headstart concept for, quite frankly, racial reasons.

When I was in Mississippi this spring, I discovered that there had been one white mother in Jackson—a liberal

woman—who had been willing to enroll her child in a Headstart program in that part of Jackson, Miss.

She was threatened and they attempted to ostracize her. She had a great deal of courage. She kept the child in the program. However, to have one child out of approximately 30 engaged in a program in that manner is pretty unsatisfactory.

This happened because the community consensus in that area was such that we could not do much about getting the Headstart program rolling if it were going to be under the jurisdiction of a local school board.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, to complete my fourth point—

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I join the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, in opposing the amendment.

I should like to engage in a colloquy with the Senator for a few minutes.

Mr. CLARK. I should be delighted to do so.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Is it not a fact that there is greater interest in this program in Congress and among the people of the United States than in any other aspect of the poverty program?

Mr. CLARK. I think that is true. I am glad the Senator raised that point. I believe that the Senator from Colorado will agree with that, although he believes in his point that the program would do even better under the Office of Education. I disagree with that point of view.

I think that things are going good.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. It seems to me that the program is a great success. Everybody recognizes it as being a great success. The investigations made by every committee of Congress concerned with the matter have established that the program is a great success.

When we consider all of the criticism that has been leveled at the OEO and the poverty program, we realize there has generally been less criticism directed at this program than at any other.

The program has been administered well. It has been directed properly. It has accomplished a great deal of good. It seems to me to be very strange, when this program has been an effective program, has been administered properly, and has accomplished a great deal, and everybody recognizes that those who have administered it have shown a great deal of attention and compassion and understanding for the problem, to then say: "It has been such a success that we will take it out of the area where it is being properly administered and where it is doing well, and put it under the Commissioner in the Office of Education who has said, 'We are not tooled up to handle this program.'"

In an exchange between the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] and the Commissioner of Education, the Commissioner, when asked if the Office of Ed-



ucation could handle Headstart, said specifically that he did not think they could, that they were not prepared to do so.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I would like to read into the RECORD that part of the discussion had in the hearings on July 25, 1967, before the Senate Education Subcommittee on the 1967 amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Senator DOMINICK addressed a question to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Harold Howe, who would have supervision of this program if the amendment were agreed to. The question related to transferring this program. Mr. Howe replied:

I think that actually the operation of Headstart under OEO, under the present arrangement, makes a great deal of sense; that we are not geared up for it; that the flexibility that OEO has in dealing with the whole variety of community agencies that are offering Headstart programs is a well-established flexibility that would be more difficult for us to establish. And it seems to me that our cooperation with them in joint arrangements in which we offer title I preschool programs is working well.

*So that I do not believe that the idea of making a transfer of Headstart to the Office of Education is one that ought to be pursued, for reasons of administrative efficiency, or for the operation of that program.*

I think that these programs can go along as they are, and that there is good cooperation between these two major agencies.

That is a quotation from Mr. Harold Howe. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] pursued a similar line with Mr. Howe later in the course of the hearings and asked:

Is there any reason why the Office of Education could not operate the Headstart program on a grant basis similar for example, to title I—and thereby avoid the church-State conflict?

Mr. Howe replied:

I think our arrangements for handling private school pupils and handling the facilities to provide Headstart activities for pupils are somewhat less flexible under title I legislation than is the case with OEO legislation, and therefore, I think there might be a problem connected to private school pupils, but I would assume that with new legislation that could be worked out.

I would assume that, with new legislation, that could be worked out.

I thank the Senator very much for calling that to my attention.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I should like to point out a couple of other points that I believe are important.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may temporarily yield the floor to the distinguished junior Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, first, we would be taking the program out of an agency in which it has been very successful and effective and placing it under a department that says it is not prepared to handle it.

Second, evidence compiled by the Office of Education concerning the experience with this kind of a problem in school systems all over the country makes it

apparent on the face of it that they are not equipped to handle the problem.

The great cities of our Nation have known of the problem for decades. We have seen the results of their work. By the time a child in a slum school in the city of New York, or any of the other cities which has a large number of poor reaches the third grade, he is 1 year behind. By the time he reaches the sixth grade he is 2 years behind.

Between the fifth and eighth grades, under our present educational system, the average child in a ghetto school loses 10 points in his IQ.

I would say that we should not be overwhelmed with the success and effectiveness of the educational system existing in our country as it pertains to the very poor.

Only three out of 10 children in poverty areas graduate from high school, and yet even those three who graduate from high school have only a 50-50 chance of having the equivalent of an eighth-grade education.

It seems to me that Headstart has been successful where it is. The Commissioner of Education says that it makes no sense to switch the Headstart program to the Office of Education because his agency is not equipped to deal with it.

If we look at the educational systems around our country, we have to recognize, as Commissioner Howe recognizes, that in other localities in the country and in the smaller cities of the country they have no programs which have been imaginative or very effective in dealing with this kind of problem.

Moreover, there are some areas of the country where the present approach to Headstart is especially important, areas where there is a conflict between those who are running the Headstart program and the State authorities.

When we were in Mississippi, as the Senator from Pennsylvania knows, we examined a very good program—the Child Development Group of Mississippi.

If this group, the Child Development Group of Mississippi, and certain other efforts in that State and in other States were changed over and put under the office of education of the particular State involved, there is no question that it would destroy the effectiveness of the program.

Anybody who looks at the Headstart program under the direction of CDGM is impressed by the program and what they have done. Anyone examining the program will notice how the program has touched the lives of these children. If that program is changed or transferred over to the control of the State department of education, it would be destroyed. We have to recognize and face up to that fact.

Furthermore, the Headstart program is more than just an educational program. It has an effect on the parents. It brings in the parents. It has an effect on the community. That has not been done at the present time in the regular school systems, at least not in the major cities of the United States. The child and the parent are remote from the direction of the regular educational system.

That is one of the advantages of the

Headstart program. If we change the Headstart program and transfer it over to a Department of Education, we will lose all of that. We will lose the participation of parents, the idea that it will be a year-round program, and the idea that this is really a program which is supposed to be controlled by the people in the local community.

It is not directed by somebody from Washington or from the State capital or from the mayor's office. I believe that is extremely important, and that is one of the reasons why this program has been so effective.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Do I correctly understand the Senator to mean that, as has been explained by the Senator from Colorado when I believe the Senator from New York was absent from the Chamber, there would be no change except an immediate change in the top of the administration?

The program as it is presently set up is working so well that no one, least of all the Senator from California, would suggest change in this program. The heads of the departments of education would have the good sense and judgment not to destroy this program, which is so important.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I have several points I should like to make in connection with that matter.

The Office of Education says it is unequipped to deal with it. There is no question that in many of the cities we have toured, the local departments of education or boards of education would be unequipped to deal with this matter.

Furthermore, under the amendment—I have read the minority views—

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I just finish my points?

Mr. MURPHY. I do not want to lose the point the Senator from New York just made.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I do not want the Senator to lose it, either. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. MURPHY. I have the good fortune to serve on both committees, and the evidence that we have had from the educators, the heads of departments of education indicate that they are equipped, that they are quite ready, and that they are capable and could do it. They believe, as I believe, that they could do it just as well and possibly lead into the follow-up programs with less dislocation and less friction for the children.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I am not familiar with that. I am familiar with the testimony of the Commissioner of Education in which he said specifically that they were not prepared.

Mr. MURPHY. He is on the same team. I am on the side of the taxpayer and the people. Actually, the Commissioner of Education must protect his brothers in bureaucracy. Otherwise, his pencils would be dull.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator from California went to Mississippi with us and recalls the organization, the

Child Development Group of Mississippi.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I believe at that time he said some words in praise of that organization and the effectiveness of some of their programs, particularly the Headstart program.

As the Senator knows, and as he pointed out when we were in Mississippi, they have operated independently of the State, and that is one of the reasons why they have been effective. Under the proposed amendment, that would no longer be possible.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I finish?

Mr. DOMINICK. I just want the Senator from New York to know that what he said is not true. I suggest that he read the amendment again.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. May I finish?

Mr. DOMINICK. Do not come in and say that you could not continue it, because that is not the fact.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I should like to point out the section of the amendment which I believe raises the problem about the CDGM. It is section 702 on page 3, and it says the State plan is to be one which "sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 701 will be used solely to make grants to community action boards."

In the first place, CDGM is not a community action board or a delegate agency of a community action board. So it could not be funded under that provision.

Section 702 goes on, on page 4, and says "or in any community where there is no qualified community action board," the funds are to go "to local educational agencies to assist them in carrying on preschool programs which, under subsection (b), are eligible for assistance under this title."

Therefore, Headstart funds would have to go through the State department of education, which in this case would be the State of Mississippi, which is opposed to CDGM, and on to the local schools, which are also opposed to CDGM.

Mr. DOMINICK. Will the Senator refer to the page from which he is reading?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I have read from the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. On what page?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. On what page?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Page 3, section 702(a) (2).

Mr. MURPHY. While the Senator from Colorado is looking for the place, will the Senator from New York permit me to say that I do not actually recall having enough knowledge of the activities of this group in Mississippi. I only recall the experience in Mississippi in which we discovered, jointly, that people there were starving. And I am ashamed to say that, so far as I can learn, I do not believe that problem has been rectified.

With all due respect to the Senator, I

am quite certain that I did not make extensive remarks with respect to the other item, because I would have no knowledge. Under the proposal I coauthored, there would be no change in the operation. There would be merely change in the top responsibility, and it would be passed from OEO to the Department of Education.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I say to the Senator that I do not believe all of us can remember every witness or everything is said at a hearing; but it is a fact that while the Senator from California was present, representatives of this organization, CDGM, did testify. I believe we can obtain the testimony. I believe we all were impressed with what they were doing. The Senator might not have attended it. I do not question that. But the fact is that it does change—I just use this as an example, and I am sure there are other examples—it does change the possibility of an organization such as this operating effectively or successfully in the State.

Mr. MURPHY. I should like to say once more that we are writing of legislation to affect the 50 States. I understand that in certain States, certain areas, there will be problems. But in the writing of legislation for 50 States, I must be guided by the testimony I have heard, as a member of the Subcommittee on Education, which convinced me that the educators, the educational groups around the country, are ready and believe they are capable of doing the job.

I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I thank the Senator from California. I am on that committee as well, and I know how conscientious the Senator from California has been about these matters.

Mr. DOMINICK. In answer to the point about which we were speaking earlier, I cite subsection (b), on page 5, which states that a preschool program shall be eligible for assistance if it is carried on by, or under contract arrangements with, a community action board.

This would take care of the system in existence in Mississippi. If that would not take care of it, we reserve 10 percent to the Commissioner of Education, which he could distribute in any way he wished. He could do it directly from the Commissioner of Education to the child development and growth group about which the Senator is speaking.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I said that it really does not deal with this problem, because there are other organizations such as this around the country which are not delegate agencies, and do not operate by contract with community action boards. They, like CDGM, are funded directly. Nor is it at all clear to me from the language of the amendment that it does give the Commission the authority to fund a group like CDGM directly.

The Senator from Colorado and I might disagree in this respect, but we cannot disagree with respect to the fact that if the amendment of the Senator from Colorado is adopted, many changes will be made in the manner in which the program is operated.

Mr. DOMINICK. I hope changes will be made, because they should be made.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. The Senator has well pointed out that the Headstart program has been rated a success by almost all those who testified. In addition to the assistance that is given to the child who participates in the Headstart program, as the Senator has also pointed out, the parents are directly affected. They are given an opportunity, under this program, to participate, and, in the nonprofessional jobs to become directly involved in the work of the Headstart program.

In addition, many other nonprofessionals from the community are hired to work in the program, and many volunteers from outside the community come in to help.

It seems to me that here we have a program which admittedly is successful and is working. To disrupt the program at this time would be a source of great discouragement not only to the parents of the children in Headstart but also to the country as a whole. We have had unfortunate experiences with some of the so-called poverty programs. But here we have a program which is working well, and to attempt to disrupt it in any way might be very injurious not only to Headstart but to the whole concept of a concerted effort to eradicate poverty in America.

Mr. President, I have great respect for the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. BROOKE. I have great respect for both of them and certainly, under normal circumstances, I would agree with them that the Office of Education would be the proper place for a program such as Headstart. This would be true under normal circumstances and in the best of all possible worlds. But let us face it. We do not have the best of all possible worlds. We know there will be serious problems if Headstart is taken out of the Office of Economic Opportunity and placed under the Office of Education before they are ready to assume responsibility for it.

I wonder what provisions, if any, the Senator from Colorado would have in his amendment to protect the Headstart program from school systems that admittedly do not want to participate in such a program?

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may answer the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts, if this dislocation were a fact, why it would be fair to assume that the Office of Education would create a dislocation? Why assume this to be so and that it cannot be administered by someone other than OEO? I think sometimes an assumption of this type may be very good, but for all practical purposes, I do



not think we should rush at it too quickly and assume it to be a fait accompli.

This program might be improved, and some of the problems about which the distinguished Senator is concerned, as I am, might be improved by the changes. I am not certain of this. I cannot assume that it would or would not. However, that would be my hope. I would hope from all of the evidence on both sides that it might work better.

Mr. BROOKE. I do not assume that the transfer from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education would necessarily result in dislocation. I cannot make that assumption and I think the Senator from California is quite correct.

However, we do know that the Director of the Office of Education has said before the committee that his office is not in a position to accept the program at the present time.

We know from the record, and from the problems which many States have had with their own school systems, that they are not in a position to accept a Headstart program. We know the school systems in the country, generally speaking, are not able to bring in nonprofessional personnel to work in the community with the Headstart program. And they have had nothing in their programs to date to indicate they could be effective in the social and psychological fields, because they are almost entirely geared to the field of formal education.

If we admit that Headstart is more than an educational program, I think the assumption would be valid that there would be dislocation if we place it in the Office of Education rather than in the Office of Economic Opportunity.

My main point, however, is that Headstart is working under the Office of Economic Opportunity. It has been called a magnificent success. Why stop a success. We need more of it.

I say at this time that since the Office of Education is not able to take it, why not leave it there.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point to permit me to answer some of these points?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Colorado and he, then, can yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I wish to point out two things. First, one-third of all the full year Headstart programs are being operated by school systems now, and two-thirds of those are in the summertime. I cite as authority for this statement the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] who so stated on September 22, 1967, in a colloquy with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. There is already some experience in this field by our schools.

Second, this particular amendment would reserve 10 percent to the Commissioner of Education wherever he thinks and under such criteria as he thinks there should be, which gives flexibility to take care of specific problems.

Third, subsection (6) on page 4 of the proposal provides that the State plan must provide a balanced program to meet the "educational, nutritional, health,

clothing, and other unique needs of children from impoverished backgrounds in order for them to function at optimum levels in relationship to other children."

Fourth, it provides, under section (5), that the program can be operated by or under contracts with the Community Action Board.

These safeguards are in here.

Finally, I would conclude by pointing out that in August 1966, Mr. Gardner, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in his testimony before the Committee on Government Operations said, with respect to the Headstart program:

However, we are doing the same thing under title I and I think we in our Department believe that eventually all of these preschool efforts will have to find their home in our Department.

We transferred the work study program and the adult education program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education, and they are working fine.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOMINICK. I would be happy to yield if I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has the floor.

Mr. BROOKE. Would parochial schools and settlement houses be able to operate schools under the amendment?

Mr. DOMINICK. Yes, by contract; under the State plan by contract with the Community Action Board.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts said that in Los Angeles the Headstart program is funded under ESCA. They are doing the work, they are getting along fine, and may be considered one of the best examples. I think the Senator's fears may be unfounded. There is great overlap already.

Mr. DOMINICK. If Senators will note the summary which is on the desk of each Senator, they will see that this matter has been endorsed by the Council of Chief State School Officers, Great Cities for School Improvement, National Congress of Parents and Teachers, National Association of State Boards of Education, National Association of State School Boards, and the National Education Association.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I do not think that all of those organizations are in favor of segregation or anything of that kind.

Mr. BROOKE. Did representatives of these agencies appear before the committee when the committee held hearings?

Mr. DOMINICK. No; but they appeared before the Subcommittee on Education. This is part of the problem. At that time I asked them these questions in the process of those hearings. I do not want to give the impression that they have analyzed my amendment which is now pending. They are in favor of the concept.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have to take issue with the statement of the Senator from Colorado. On September 25, 1967, I inserted in the Record a telegram sent to me on September 22 of this year signed by John M. Lumley, the director of the National Education Association, Division of Federal Regulations, in which he said:

NEA DIVISION OF  
FEDERAL REGULATIONS,

Washington, D.C., September 22, 1967.

Hon. JOSEPH CLARK,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.:

The National Education Association urges passage of S. 2388 as approved by the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, to continue operation of economic opportunity programs and to establish the Emergency Employment Act.

JOHN M. LUMLEY,  
Director.

I take that as an endorsement by the qualified officer of the National Education Association of the provision in the pending bill which would leave Headstart in the Office of Economic Opportunity as it is at the present time.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on September 22, 1967, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] said:

This is the strong lobbying position of the National Education Association and the teacher unions. There is an enormous vested interest in this country trying to get the Headstart program away from the OEO and to have it placed in the school boards. I have great respect for the National Education Association. I have quite a lot of respect for the various teacher unions. But we must recognize it for what it is; namely, a lobbying effort.

Mr. CLARK. I made that statement on the floor and then, when I went back to my office, I found that I was wrong because there was this telegram from Mr. Lumley.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for a final question?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. Is not the Office of Education obliged by law to deal only with State educational agencies and public school systems?

Mr. DOMINICK. It depends upon what authority is given to the Office of Education. In this particular amendment, we ask them to approve the State plans as formulated by the State boards and then we give them discretion of 10 percent of the amount of funding, and to take such action as they deem necessary wherever it may be, and whatever the criteria may be.

Mr. BROOKE. Then is only 10 percent to be used for agencies outside the State educational systems and the public school systems?

Mr. DOMINICK. No; to use the total amount for the next fiscal year—\$350 million. No, sir; that is not correct.

Mr. BROOKE. Would the Senator clarify it?

Mr. DOMINICK. I would be happy to do so. The amount of money authorized for 1969 and 1970 is \$350 million in 1 year and \$400 million the next year, allo-

cated to the States under the formula now in the poverty program. We reserve a certain amount of that total of 10 percent for the Commissioner of Education to use in any way he deems necessary. The State plans can provide not only for Headstart programs operating under the public school system but also for community action boards and, by contracts, through community action boards, so that there will be tremendous flexibility. The only thing we are asking is that the plan as such in each State be approved by the State board. If it is not approved, then the Commissioner must go out on his own.

Mr. BROOKE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I want to complete my argument in opposition to the amendment.

The able junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] has made so effective an argument in opposition to the amendment that it will not be necessary for me to do more than summarize quickly the reasons why, as Senator in charge of the bill, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

I had given three major reasons when I was interrupted by, I think, the useful colloquy with the Senator from Colorado and others.

My fourth reason is that the Headstart programs are presently operated primarily by the community action agencies directly, or their delegates.

It is difficult to compare Headstart programs run by CAA's with those operated by schools but OEO's experience has found that school systems have had difficulties in meeting Headstart's requirements that: parents be involved; comprehensive services be provided outside the classroom; and the program be focused on disadvantaged children.

I think that this is an excellent reason for leaving well enough alone.

My fifth reason is—as I have already stated—the Office of Education does not want it. At this time, it should not be asked to administer a Headstart program. I am pretty skeptical, frankly, about turning a program over to Harold Howe of the Office of Education, for whom I personally have great respect but who, let us face it, is a pretty controversial figure in many parts of the country at this time.

My sixth reason is that although both the EOA and the ESEA authorize preschool programs, these programs differ in several important respects: title I—ESEA—programs are generally less comprehensive than Headstart; considerably fewer children have been served annually under title I than under Headstart; most title I preschool programs have been operated during the summer whereas Headstart operates both summer and full-year programs; and title I programs serve a substantially greater proportion of children from families whose income is above the OEO eligibility levels. Headstart and title I programs are, however, coordinated through a required checkpoint procedure authorized under the ESEA.

I think perhaps the best argument which has been made in opposition to the amendment was that made by the

Senator from Massachusetts when he said, "Why do we want to change a program that is working well? Why change it?"

I have listened with great interest to the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from California. I have heard no sound reason why we want to complicate and confuse an administrative situation which is working well now, and to transfer a program to an agency that does not want it. We know from the hearings of the subcommittee that it will cause infinite difficulties in a number of States and, if we throw it into the educational system, it will destroy Headstart's flexibility.

Mr. President, I am now prepared to yield the floor and vote, if my friend from Colorado is about ready.

Mr. DOMINICK. I am prepared to yield, in about 3 minutes. I want to make a summary. Since I am the proposer of the amendment, I presume I should get an opportunity to say the last word on a couple of points.

The fact that we have problems with coordination between the school system and Headstart is very apparent. Strong evidence is the fact that in the new poverty bill we have had to put in a Follow Through program, which is represented as a means to bridge the gap. The so-called Follow Through program provides \$120 million and may well interject the poverty program into our school systems. It is my hope that by transferring Headstart over to the Office of Education we will eliminate this need, as of next year, when the proposal would start. Thus, we would be able to see if we have corrected the problems by moving the program. It strikes me that with the groups we have supporting this transfer in principle, at least, we should use this opportunity to take the program and put it into an office which has jurisdiction and expertise on the subject. We would then be able to move forward with a coordinated program which will cut down the overall expense and increase the opportunity and the scope of a very useful program.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, as a cosponsor I want to add my support to amendment No. 342 which would transfer the Headstart program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in the fiscal year 1969. The amendment is supported by educational leaders throughout Arizona and the Nation.

There can be little question that the Headstart program has been a successful innovation in education. It has given countless thousands of children the opportunity for a preschool educational experience which, in many cases, compensates for deficiencies which would affect their ability to learn, not only in the first grade but throughout their entire school experience. I am confident, however, that the Headstart program can be made even more successful if we make this administrative change. It seems to me, as it does to most educational leaders with whom I have spoken, to make good sense to coordinate all educational programs into the one agency of Govern-

ment Congress established for that purpose.

While I have no quarrel with the OEO officials who have operated Headstart, and for the most part they have done an able job, it seems to me that they have enough to do in other poverty programs to keep them amply busy.

There is little doubt in my mind that the Headstart program will be greatly expanded in years to come. Therefore, now is an opportune time to transfer the administrative duties to the Office of Education, which is staffed with the professional educators who can best guide the program's operation.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, each year almost 1 million children of poverty enter school for the first time. These children usually bring with them, not a new dress or shirt pocket full of crayons, but a lack of self-confidence, a built-in mistrust of adults—in short, a fear of the whole experience.

In order to combat this deprivation, the Office of Economic Opportunity instituted what we now know as the Headstart program, designed to be the first vital step toward breaking the cycle of poverty.

In his message on America's children and youth, delivered on February 8 of this year, the President said of the program:

Headstart has passed its first trials with flying colors. Tested in practice the past two years, it has proven worthy of its promise.

Now, there now are those, Mr. President, who advocate transferring the Headstart program from OEO to the Office of Education. Their primary argument has been that the local program should be run exclusively by the local school systems.

This reasoning is both impractical and illogical. Many school systems are unwilling or unable to run Headstart programs. For the program is not solely concerned with education: There are medical, dental, and nutritional aspects—to name but a few—which school systems simply are not prepared to handle. This past year, a full 60 percent of the year-long programs were run by organizations other than school systems.

Also, parents play a vital role in developing local Headstart policies and programs. The result is that parents begin to take a more active role in the educational development of their children. As the National Education Association has testified, many school systems are simply not ready to work with parents on anything resembling this basis.

In addition, some school systems cannot by law, and others will not, establish early childhood development programs. Thus a transfer of Headstart to the Office of Education could well mean the end of many local preschool programs.

Finally, Mr. President, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John W. Gardner, has said that his office is not prepared at this time to assume the functions of the Headstart program.

Because it is vital that the program be continued and expanded; because the progress that has been made these past 2 years must not now be jeopardized;



and because the Office of Economic Opportunity which initiated Headstart is best qualified to continue its direction, we must not disrupt the program by pointlessly transferring it to the Office of Education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 54, as follows:

[No. 269 Leg.]

#### YEAS—35

Allott	Ellender	Monroney
Baker	Ervin	Morton
Bennett	Fannin	Mundt
Boggs	Fong	Murphy
Byrd, Va.	Griffin	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Hansen	Scott
Carlson	Hartke	Smith
Cooper	Holland	Thurmond
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Tower
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Long, La.	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	Miller	

#### NAYS—54

Aiken	Hatfield	Mondale
Anderson	Hayden	Montoya
Bartlett	Hill	Moss
Bayh	Hollings	Muskie
Bible	Inouye	Nelson
Brewster	Jackson	Pell
Brooke	Javits	Percy
Burdick	Kennedy, Mass.	Proxmire
Cannon	Kennedy, N.Y.	Randolph
Case	Long, Mo.	Ribicoff
Church	Magnuson	Sparkman
Clark	Mansfield	Spong
Dodd	McCarthy	Stennis
Eastland	McClellan	Talmadge
Gore	McGee	Tydings
Gruening	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Harris	McIntyre	Yarborough
Hart	Metcalf	Young, Ohio

#### NOT VOTING—11

Fulbright	Lausche	Russell
Hickenlooper	Morse	Smathers
Hruska	Pastore	Symington
Kuchel	Pearson	

So Mr. DOMINICK's amendments were rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9960) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, offices, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. EVINS of Tennessee, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. GAIAMO, Mr. SHIPLEY, Mr. MARSH, Mr. PRYOR, Mr. MAHON, Mr. JONAS, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. TALCOTT, and Mr. BOW were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

#### ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2388) to provide an improved Economic Opportunity Act, to authorize funds for the continued operation of economic opportunity programs, to authorize an Emergency Employment Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Delaware withhold his request for a quorum call?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as far as the floor manager of the bill is concerned, he is ready for a third reading.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 347

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 347 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read, as follows:

On page 7 strike all after the period in line 20 and all of lines 21 through 25, of lines 1 and 2 on page 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "In the case of an individual with a history of serious and violent behavior, or a history of repetitive or serious law violation or delinquent acts, such determination must be supported by a signed

statement from the individual's local Federal or State district attorney, sheriff, or chief of police certifying that the individual, if selected, is likely to participate successfully in the program and is unlikely to engage in activities or behavior that would impede other enrollees from receiving the benefit of the program or be incompatible with the maintenance of sound discipline and satisfactory relationships between any center to which he might be assigned and surrounding communities."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I note that the manager of the bill is temporarily absent from the floor. In deference to him, I think I should save the discussion of my amendment until he returns.

Mr. President, I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, in the course of this year, the Senator from Pennsylvania has performed a task seldom undertaken in connection with congressional consideration of legislation to renew a Federal program. With his constructive energy and flair, his usual creativity and deep commitment, Senator CLARK has conducted an examination of the war on poverty that was both just and judicious, exhaustive and, I might say, a bit exhausting. In the course of the last 8 months, the Senator has crisscrossed the country, hearing hundreds of witnesses, seeing and talking with thousands of the poor, and examining dozens of local programs.

As a member of the subcommittee, it was my privilege to join Senator CLARK on a number of his field trips—to Mississippi, to California, to Chicago, to Boston, to New York City, and to homes and programs just a few blocks from where we stand. What struck me as we visited around the country was that if other Senators—whatever their committee assignment, whatever their party, whatever section of the country they are from—had a chance to make the same kind of exhaustive investigation that Senator CLARK has chaired, there would be no opposition to the continuation of the Economic Opportunity Act and, though there might be differences of opinion on the way in which the program should be administered, there would be no disagreement that the present level of funding, and even that proposed by the committee, is grossly inadequate.

For, as one travels around the country to examine conditions of poverty and to investigate our efforts to deal with it, a national picture comes into focus, a picture which transcends one's view of poverty in his own State. We all know there is no area of our country which is totally affluent, which does not contain poverty. But I am convinced that only the exhaustive national survey which the subcommittee undertook gives one a deep, intuitive sense of the extent of the problem and the need to act. From Negro cotton choppers in Mississippi to jobless

Negro teenagers in Hough, from people of Spanish surnames in isolated northern New Mexico to Mexican Americans in East Los Angeles, from former coal miners in West Virginia to Appalachian whites who have migrated to Chicago, from Sioux Indians on their reservations in South Dakota to the Indian community in Minneapolis, from Eskimos in Alaska to Puerto Ricans in East Harlem—all over the Nation there are people in extreme poverty—men and women and children without jobs and without hope, without decent housing and without enough to eat.

I believe the experience of an investigation such as we made gives one a special sense of the magnitude of the problem and the urgency of action.

But, everywhere we went we also saw the impact of the war on poverty—Headstart programs, opening new worlds to small children and their parents, Neighborhood Youth Corps and Job Corps programs giving new hope to young men and young women, neighborhood legal services and neighborhood health centers, providing legal protection and medical care to people for the first time.

Our study gave us a firsthand sense of what the war on poverty is, of what its possibilities are, of what it is accomplishing, of what it could accomplish if we were to give it the funds and the resources to fulfill its potential. For if there were desperate, frustrated poor people in every community we visited, there were hopeful, helpful programs as well.

In Mississippi we saw pathetically hungry children and families which had literally no cash income because the revolution in farm technology had deprived them of what little work they had. But we also saw children in Headstart centers, grown men learning to read for the first time, young men and women learning job skills, families receiving Federal food aid.

In California we saw migrant workers living in upturned cars on riverbanks, but we also saw migrant housing and education program which bring more promise to those workers than they have ever had before.

Here in Washington we saw housing within sight of the Nation's Capitol that strained belief. But we also heard what the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps have done for some of the young men and women who live here in the District.

Whatever the program—Headstart, Upward Bound, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Job Corps, neighborhood health centers, and so on—the picture is really the same: These programs have made a great difference in the lives of thousands, but there are hundreds of thousands more who have not been reached.

The amount of money authorized in the committee bill is really a bare minimum—a grossly inadequate figure when compared to the scope of the problem. For as the Department of Labor stated flatly in its 1967 manpower report:

Economic and social conditions are getting worse, not better in slum areas.

So we must act. For if we do not, the violence and destruction, the fear and fury which blazed in our cities this sum-

mer will continue. But more than that, we must act not just because failure to act will bring further violence, but because we must give some encouragement to those who still believe that progress is possible within our established institutions. We cannot denounce extremists who reject our social system if we do not prove that that system is capable of helping people lead a better life.

The riots which have taken place—and which may all too easily take place in the future—are, of course, an intolerable threat to the essential interests of all of us. A violent few cannot be permitted to threaten the well-being of the many and the hopes of their fellows for progress. Those who lead others to burn and loot must feel the full force of the law.

That, however, is just the beginning, and we should not delude ourselves. The riots are not crises which can be resolved as suddenly as they arose. They are the result of a condition which has been with us for 300 years and will be with us for many years more. We can deal with the crises without dealing with the underlying problem—just as we can give novocaine to a man with a broken arm, without setting that arm in a splint; but the end result will only be more pain, pain beyond temporary relief, and permanent crippling of our society.

And until we deal with the underlying conditions, we are in grave danger: the danger of a deepening division between white and black America, that fear will breed resentment, and resentment hostility, and increasing hostility again feed mounting fear.

This division represents not a failure of compassion, or of the American sense of justice; rather it is a failure of understanding and communication. We live in different worlds and gaze out over a different landscape. Through the eyes of the white majority, the man of decent impulse and moral purpose, the Negro world is one of steady and continuous progress. In a few years, he has seen the entire structure of discriminatory legislation torn down. He has heard Presidents become spokesmen for racial justice, while Negro Americans enter the Cabinet and the Supreme Court. The white American has paid taxes for poverty and education programs, and watched his children risk their lives to register voters in Alabama. Seeing this, he asks, what cause can there be for violent insurrection, or dissatisfaction with present progress?

But if we try to look through the eyes of the young slum dweller—the Negro, and the Puerto Rican, and the Mexican American—the world is a dark and hopeless place indeed.

The chances are that this young man was born into a family without a father—often as a result of welfare laws which require a broken home as a condition of help. His chance of dying in the first year of life is twice that of children born outside the slum, and inadequate prenatal care also assures that if he survives, his chances of being mentally retarded are seven times the community average.

He begins to grow, often crowded with adults into one or two rooms, without

adequate plumbing or heat, each night trying to defend himself against marauding rats.

He goes to a school which teaches little that helps him in an alien world. The chances are 7 out of 10 that he will not graduate from high school—and even when he does, he has only a 50-50 chance of acquiring the equivalent of an eighth-grade education. At one high school which I have visited a number of times and which is not atypical—located in the wealthiest city, in the wealthiest State, in the wealthiest Nation in the world—25 percent of the freshmen read at fourth-grade level or below; half cannot read above sixth-grade level.

For the rest of his life also there are statistics: prices for the most basic commodities are far higher than in the rest of the city; 43 percent of ghetto housing is substandard and overcrowded; tens of thousands of children are treated for rat bites each year; and of a quarter of a million Puerto Rican schoolchildren in New York City, only 37 went on to college last year.

Worst of all, the people of the ghetto and the barrio live today with an unemployment rate far worse than the rest of the Nation knew during the depth of the great depression. If the unemployment of the depression was a national emergency—and it was—our cities today therefore envelop dozens of even greater emergencies. Unemployment in the poverty districts—among Negroes in Hough, Mexican Americans in East Los Angeles, Appalachian whites in Chicago, Puerto Ricans in East Harlem, Indians on reservations—in short, among groups of Americans of every race and background—is at least three times the national rate and is rising.

But even this does not measure the full extent of the problem. The Labor Department recently did a special subemployment survey which included people not in the labor force at all, people working only part time and people working but not earning a substantial wage, which showed that 28.6 percent of the working-age population in Harlem and 33.6 percent in East Harlem fall into these categories.

In other cities the subemployment rate is even worse—as high as 45.3 percent in the slums of New Orleans and 47.4 percent in the barrio of San Antonio.

The Department of Labor's 1967 Manpower Report says flatly:

Slum residents have been bypassed by the national rise in real family income. In South Los Angeles—a predominantly Negro poverty area—median family income rose by only 4 percent between 1959 and 1965 and in East Los Angeles—a heavily Mexican-American low-income area—by only 0.2 percent, despite an average rise of 8 percent in consumer prices for urban families.

In other words, real family income in these two areas of Los Angeles dropped by 4 and 8 percent, respectively—while real family income nationwide was rising by 14 percent. From June 1965 to June 1966, 950,000 new jobs were created for young men, but only 33,000, about 3.7 percent, went to Negroes. A Labor Department spokesman explained that Negro youths “just don't have the connections.”



Nor is the problem confined to urban areas. Just in the Mississippi Delta, which I visited last April with the subcommittee, there are even now 40,000 to 60,000 people who literally have no cash income. And migrant farmworkers have also been left totally out of the economic mainstream, earning an average of \$1,200 a year from farmwork and \$600 from odd jobs. The conditions under which they live and work, which I have seen as I have visited them around the country, are shocking in the last third of the 20th century. Finally, the poverty on Indian reservations is severe, with unemployment ranging up to 80 percent and men dying at 42 years of age, on the average, which is 25 years below the average for the white man.

Mr. President, I might say that although poverty conditions are as bad as I have described them in this part of the United States, the conditions for the Indians, and Eskimos in Alaska are probably the worst conditions of any group.

These, then, are the problems. They will not be banished with force; and they will not just go away. Thirty million poor people all over our Nation are a reality. The slums are a reality, as are idleness and poverty, lack of education and dilapidated housing. Frustrated expectations and disappointed hopes are realities. Above all, the awareness of injustice and the passion to end it are inescapable realities. No force in the world can wish these facts out of existence. Thus we have only one choice. We can face our difficulties and strive to overcome them, with imagination and dedication and wisdom and love. Or we can turn away—bringing repression, steadily increasing human pain and civil strife, and leaving a problem of far more terrible and threatening proportions to our children.

For history has placed us all, black and white, within a common border and under a common law. All of us, from the wealthiest and most powerful of men to the weakest and hungriest of children, share one precious possession: the name "American." It is not easy to know what that means. But in part to be an American means to have been an outcast and a stranger, to have come to the exiles' country, and to know that he who denies the outcast and stranger among us, at that moment also denies America.

We have begun to meet our responsibilities. The Office of Economic Opportunity has been an innovative and creative agency. It has stimulated a new partnership with private industry in the Job Corps, in other job training, and in the development of quasi-public housing corporations to use the skill of private industry in slum rehabilitation. OEO's neighborhood health centers are an experiment in new ways of delivering health services which could revolutionize health services not just for the poor but for all of us. The New York Times described Headstart as "the most significant educational advance in the past decade."

But the point about all of this is that it is only a beginning. If 700,000 children participated in Headstart this past year, there are hundreds of thousands more who need its special help. If more than

300,000 people were served by OEO legal services this past year, there are hundreds of thousands more who need legal help. If the neighborhood health centers funded this past year will ultimately serve 875,000 poor people, there are hundreds of thousands more who need decent health care. For there are still over 30 million poor people in our Nation, still over 30 million men, women, and children who have been left behind as our country has reached new plateau after new plateau of affluence.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate today is the result of an unusually careful study by the members of the subcommittee and their staffs. I think the subcommittee staff is especially to be commended. The bill makes a number of important changes in the structure and administration of OEO. It provides a panoply of new means to assure a coordination of Office of Economic Opportunity programs with other Federal programs which have an impact on the poor. The Senator from Pennsylvania explained these new means of coordination in articulate detail the other day. It provides a new coordination role for the States, which is based on the observations we made around the country. And it provides for greater local initiative in choosing the particular OEO-financed programs which will be developed and applied in each community. For we heard again and again that the programs which worked best were the ones which people in the community themselves chose and developed themselves, and in which, therefore, they had the greatest stake.

I would mention only four major points regarding the bill today: First, that the level of funding authorized in title I of the bill—that is, in the economic opportunity amendments—not be cut; second, that proposals to spin off component programs not be heeded; third, that the 2-year authorization for OEO which was adopted by the committee not be rejected; fourth, that title II of the bill—the Emergency Employment Act, not be rejected.

First, the committee did increase the authorized funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity from \$2.06 billion to \$2.258 billion. I believe it would be unfortunate if those additional funds were eliminated. They were added to allow funding for a number of items that the committee felt especially important. One of our major findings as we went across the country was that individual programs have too often been cut back by Washington as more applicants appeared to claim a slice of a pie that has not grown fast enough to accommodate them all. These cutbacks at the local level have been extremely damaging. They cause great bitterness and great frustration. The \$198 million which the committee added would alleviate this problem somewhat, and to cut it would, correspondingly, have a most damaging effect throughout the country. I urge the Senate to reject any such proposal.

I might give an example of the kind of cutback which the committee's action might alleviate, although it will not deal with it completely. This summer we had

a job program in the city of New York, and there were comparable ones across the country, encompassing a total of 40,000 jobs. After September there was a cutback to 7,000 jobs, so that all of those who held jobs were turned into the street with no place to go. It is that kind of practice, it seems to me, which stimulates violence and lawlessness, and the dissatisfaction which many people feel about our Government and society.

We have all talked about the hot summers and we are all concerned about what is going to happen next summer. It seems to me that these problems are not going to be confined to the summers. We are going to have the same kind of difficulty 12 months a year if we continue directing these programs in the way we have been over a period of several years. That is the responsibility we must accept in Congress, as well as in the executive branch of Government, and, I might add, at the local community level as well. I do not think by any means this is the sole responsibility of the Federal Government. But one way in which we in Congress can exercise our share of the responsibility is to reject any effort to cut back the \$198 million which the committee added.

Second, there is talk that various programs—whether Headstart or Upward Bound or Neighborhood Youth Corps—should be removed entirely from the administration and control of the Office of Economic Opportunity and given to other agencies. Our hearings do not support the spin-off idea. Of over 400 witnesses before the committee, only two advocated the abolition of OEO and the transfer of its functions to other agencies. And the record is replete with the testimony of administration officials—OEO, HEW, Labor, and others—that the present distribution of programs is best and should not be disturbed.

Headstart, for example, is not just an education program. As I said earlier, it seeks to develop the child in relation to his family and the world around him, and a critical part of this is parental involvement. I think transfer to the Office of Education, with the implied presumption that this would involve about running all Headstart programs through local school systems, could cause the unique flavor of Headstart to be lost.

Similarly, there are proposals to transfer some aspects of the Neighborhood Youth Corps to Labor and others to HEW. This double transfer idea raises obvious coordination problems that do not exist now, and the very fact that two agencies are suggested as transferee implies that neither proposal is really better than the present situation.

Third, I believe the 2-year authorization for the program which the committee adopted is wise. The poverty program has proven itself sufficiently now so that annual re-examination is not required. The consequences of annual re-examination, with all the uncertainty that that causes around the country, are damaging. Competent personnel often cannot be attracted to work in a program which has promise of lasting for only a few months. Participation by the community is carried on in an atmosphere of doubt

and mistrust. And the burden on Congress is great as well. We will do both the poor and ourselves a great service if we begin now to give the program the extra year of breathing space which the committee bill provides.

Fourth, and critically important, is title II, the Emergency Employment Act. We have always known, or at least we have said to one another, that employment—useful, productive work—is the most fundamental avenue to solving poverty. Yet our actions have not lived up to our observations, as the figures which I quoted at length earlier indicate.

And the crisis in unemployment is the most critical of our failures—for it is significant far beyond its economic effects. It is both measure and cause of the extent to which the poor man is alienated from the general community. More than segregation in housing and schools, more than differences in attitude of life style, it is unemployment that sets the poor man apart. Unemployment is having nothing to do—which means having nothing to do with the rest of us.

We earn our livings, support our families, purchase the comforts and ease of life with work. More important, to be without it is to be less than a man. To be without use to one's fellow citizens is to be in truth the "invisible man" of whom Ralph Ellison wrote so eloquently.

Unemployment is truly our gravest problem. This judgment has been confirmed by every board and commission, expert and amateur, official and layman, that has examined the problem. The McCone Commission looked at Los Angeles and said that the most serious problem in Watts is unemployment. Kenneth Clark's pioneering study looked at Harlem and said that Harlem's key problem is unemployment. The Urban Coalition looked to all the cities and said that the first problem is unemployment.

Title II of S. 2388 is in direct response to the problem. With the Emergency Employment Act, the Senator from Pennsylvania has come up with a program that deals directly with the difficulty, a program which will work, a program which will provide 200,000 jobs in very short order.

Providing jobs is the one step that is in everyone's interest, no matter what his political philosophy. Placing people in the position where they can obtain productive employment is the one approach that in the end will produce higher revenues and lower welfare costs; and it means lessened costs of crime and crime prevention as well. It means the use of unused resources and greater prosperity for all.

The provision of jobs will have a direct impact on the cost of welfare. A recent analysis of Federal welfare programs showed that of 7.3 million people receiving federally supported welfare assistance, only 50,000 could work. The analysis was intended to show only that the welfare rolls are not filled with deliberate idlers. Many, however, have taken it as proof that job programs cannot reduce the welfare budgets. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Of the 7.3 million welfare recipients, 850,000 were female heads of families, and 2.6 million were minor children from

these same female-headed families. Thus, over 50 percent of the Federal welfare rolls are made up of families whose husbands and fathers have left the house. Every study of poverty and its pathology shows that the vast majority of these husbands and fathers are absent precisely because they are unemployed and unable to support their families, and because leaving their wives and children was the only way to qualify for welfare.

Thus, it is the welfare system itself, in combination with the lack of decent job opportunities, that produces the welfare families who are asserted to be permanent dependents of the Government. But providing real job opportunities—for the absent fathers and husbands, and for the fathers and husbands of the future—will enable many of these families to reunite, and others to remain together, and thus help to reduce welfare and dependency—and their costs both financial and personal.

As I have said before, I think some of the provisions of the present welfare system are very worthwhile, but there are also other provisions and a philosophy which can be catastrophic for the country. In the city of New York, welfare costs \$700 million a year. In the State it costs over \$1 billion a year. And the cost is growing by leaps and bounds. The only way to get away from the costs of welfare is not to punish those on welfare, but to provide jobs so husbands and fathers can stay with their wives and children, pay taxes, and be contributing members of society, and not welfare recipients. But the only way to do that is to provide jobs. Title II, as well as the rest of the poverty program, it seems to me, is an important step in that direction.

And employment is the only true long-run solution; only if the poor achieve productive employment will they be able to support themselves and their families, become active contributing citizens, and not passive objects of action, recipients of our charity. This does not mean that education, for example, is not critical to future employment and self-sufficiency. Of course it is. But unless we achieve employment, we will never solve the problem. People with economic security can buy or rent their own housing; people with adequate incomes can see that their children are educated; people with jobs can mark out their own relationships with their fellows of whatever color. But without employment, without basic economic security and self-sufficiency, any other help we provide will be only temporary in effect.

Title II is a sensible and practical way to begin to meet our responsibilities. Had we enacted it last year or the year before and thereby perhaps headed off the wave of fire and fury which struck this summer, it would already have saved us far more than its cost. But, tragically, all too clearly, it can still save us more than it will cost. And, if we do not enact it, the cost will be more than what we save.

Let me make clear that the kind of stimulus to employment which is contained in title II is not permanent. It is an emergency program growing out of an emergency situation. It may, and hopefully will, lead to new kinds of public

service careers, for, as commission after commission, study after study has shown, there is a vast potential for new public service in a wide variety of fields. In the end, the overall employment problem will only be solved by harnessing the great engine of private enterprise to the problem. But at the same time, there are thousands of needed tasks and works in the public sector as well.

For example, there is a growing shortage of skilled and professional help in all of our social service agencies.

In health services, for example, the National League of Nursing estimates a deficit of 344,000 registered nurses by 1970. Current deficit, 125,000. For that same year mental health services predict a deficit of 200,000 employees for State and county hospitals.

In social work, some 15,000 persons are needed yearly to replace those leaving the field and to staff new services. The total number of graduates from schools of social work throughout the Nation is only 3,500 yearly. The HEW Task Force on Social Welfare, Education, and Manpower predicts a need for 100,000 social workers plus 50,000 additional workers for HEW agencies alone by 1970.

In education, the U.S. Department of Labor foresees a deficit of 500,000 elementary and secondary schoolteachers by 1970.

Title II could and would function simultaneously to fill these shortages in the human service fields and to provide on-the-job education and training to the unskilled for effective functioning at entry-level positions and for upward mobility within the agencies hiring them.

And let me make clear that there is ample experience already with the kind of employment that is contemplated by title II.

There are now, for example, 116,000 teachers aides in the United States, most hired with funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The National Education Association has allocated funds to establish a national organization of teacher aides affiliated to the NEA, and plans a national teacher aides conference for the next school year.

The Bank Street College of Education recently made a nationwide study of teacher aides, teacher assistants, family workers and other auxiliary educational personnel employed from California to Puerto Rico. It found "great possibilities in the professional-nonprofessional team in enabling the teacher 'to meet individual needs of pupils.' The multilevel approach was found to provide 'an escape from rigid structuring in the classroom with more small groupings and independent activities possible.'" The report says that any classroom can benefit from "effective utilization of auxiliaries, regardless of the composition of the school population or the socio-economic background of the auxiliaries."

Oakland, Calif. has created a "ladder of skills" for its teacher aides, in line with the "job first, diplomas later" concept of new careers. A person who first goes to work as a teacher aide can rise through an apprenticeship program to



assistant teacher, then to associate teacher—with an Associate of Arts degree, combining work experience with college courses—and finally to certified teacher.

Last June the Women's Talent Corps completed its first training program. A group of women, 23 to 54 years of age, many of whom had previously been on relief, were graduated "from hard-core poverty into expanding futures," according to the New York Times. They will fill subprofessional positions as teacher assistants and guidance assistants.

In the health and welfare fields there is also useful experience to draw upon.

For example, at the Lincoln Neighborhood Service Center Project of New York, six subprofessional mental health aides served more than 25,000 people. The total salary for the six aides was \$25,000. Cost of training, operation of the storefront center was an additional \$25,000. Thus, the center was able to provide vital service to 25,000 persons by spending only \$2 for each individual receiving aid. This is for a 1-year period.

Besides providing direct services for the clients of the center, the aides also organized a number of neighborhood meetings, committees, parties, and special programs. In this way another 20 to 25 percent of the neighborhood, beyond those who received direct service, were benefited by these other types of activities.

And there has been other interesting experience in working with unemployed youth.

Dramatic success was achieved by the Howard University community apprentice program when it motivated and trained a group of "hard-core" disadvantaged young men to become research, preschool, and recreation aides. They all bore the scars of poverty: delinquency records, functional illiteracy, broken homes, fragmented schooling, low measured IQs. As they learned and worked, they were oriented toward further attainment. They obtained more advanced jobs, returned to school, ceased delinquent behavior, went on to college, and have had significant jumps in their measured IQs.

The homework helpers program started by Mobilization for Youth produced striking benefits for both the teenage tutors and their pupils. The youths hired by the agency to tutor slow-reader grade school students significantly raised the reading levels of their pupils but also vastly improved their own abilities, picking up an average of 3½ years in reading skill.

Finally, the Community Action programs already employ 130,000 nonprofessionals. Research by Daniel Yankelovich, Inc., on a sample of 5,000 of these workers in nine cities indicated that these workers have been doing a very effective job, and that they display high morale and considerable involvement in their work, and have been well accepted by professionals.

The Emergency Employment Act is therefore, a well-conceived and practical program. There is ample evidence that there is a potential of far more than 200,000 useful, productive jobs which could be created now in the fields of health, education, police work, recrea-

tion, and welfare casework. And there is ample evidence from experience that we already have in employing subprofessional personnel under existing Federal legislation that such a program is practicable and workable. It will help in rural as well as urban areas, and will help create jobs in private enterprise as well as public service.

In summary, then, I urge the Senate to enact S. 2388 as reported. For being killed is more than dying physically. Millions of Americans are dying the slow death of despair and hopelessness. With a gross national product of over \$750 billion, we can surely afford this legislation, which would cost as much as a few weeks of effort in Vietnam. Just this week we voted—by 74 to 3—a military construction bill authorizing over \$2 billion in new barracks and other building. If we can vote \$2 billion for such a purpose without any question, we can surely enact this legislation as the committee reported it.

We cannot just pay lip service to our ideals. We must enact S. 2388 in its entirety now.

Mr. President, I think this is desperately needed legislation. I do not think it is perfect, but I think it will be important in giving to those who desperately need help a feeling that there is still hope in our society and Government and give them a sign that we do care, that there is an interest in them.

I think when we vote \$70 billion for the military budget, when we vote \$2.3 billion for military construction, and when he spend days debating this program, and then propose amendments, and even pass them, involving cuts of up to \$2 billion, it is going to be a sign to the poor in our urban or our rural areas, whether they be Indians, or Mexican Americans, or Appalachia whites, or Negroes, that the Establishment does not care; that we are interested only in our own feelings, in our own protection, that which causes us and our children protection and comfort; but, as far as those who are deprived and their children are concerned, who will carry this scar and burden for the rest of their lives, and who cannot recover unless we give them that opportunity, it will be a sign that we may make public speeches, but when it comes to taking the kind of steps that will have meaning and make a change in their lives, they must look elsewhere.

I do not see how, Mr. President, we can, then, be so concerned, upset, and disturbed when we see those who are poor become disenchanted with our society. It is hard for me to believe that we need another study, another committee or commission, or whatever it might be, to investigate what the problems are. We know that the problems exist. We know that people do not have jobs; and when they do not have jobs, they are upset, just as would be all of us in the U.S. Senate were we suddenly to find ourselves unemployed.

Without employment, one cannot support his family. If you had to leave your wife and children because you could not find a job in your neighborhood, particularly if you were unskilled and untrained because of faults in our educational system, you, too, would be upset.

The poor, through no fault of their own, are unskilled and uneducated. Through no fault of their own, there are absolutely no jobs for them. Through no fault of their own, they are forced to bring their children up in houses and tenements filled with rats. Through no fault of their own, they have little hope for the future.

What have we done for them, Mr. President, here in the U.S. Senate? We talk about the war, and about the protection of our own security. That is all worthwhile enough. We talk about the fact that we need an antiballistic missile screen. Such concerns are understandable. To want to save the physical lives of the population of this country is, of course, an important objective.

But as I have pointed out, death can be more than physical destruction; and therein, too, we have a responsibility. For if a person is so lacking in education and so lacking in training that he cannot even hold a job or there are no jobs available for him, his situation is not far from living death.

Here we have a chance, it seems to me, to deal with the problem of poverty, not in a major way, but at least to do something about it in a minor way. If we fail to meet that challenge, it seems to me we are not meeting our responsibility to this body, to our constituents, nor to our country.

Mr. President, we are responsible for handing over to the next generation of Americans, with all that that implies, their country. Will it be a country filled with difficulties, problems, and bitter hopelessness? I hope not.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I thank the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] not only for his support of the committee bill, S. 2388, but particularly for his kind comments about me and about the study which the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty has been undertaking these past 6 months.

As much as any Member of the Senate, but with a particularly keen sense of awareness and compassion, Senator KENNEDY recognizes the serious problems which confront our Nation when tens of millions of our citizens are living in poverty.

I am especially grateful for the fact that the junior Senator from New York participated with me in most of the field hearings and field inspection trips in 13 communities around the country.

Following our field hearings and our hearings here in Washington the junior Senator from New York was extremely helpful in the drafting of the legislation which is now pending before the Senate. Many of the changes which the committee has made in existing law which resulted from our study and field inspections were proposed by the Senator from New York. For example, in order to make more specific the provisions of S. 2388 requiring evaluation of programs, Senator KENNEDY suggested and the bill contains a provision to assure that the opinions of program participants are considered as part of the evaluation.

At Senator KENNEDY's suggestion the

concept that financial assistance be channeled through a local community prime sponsor was made more flexible so as to encourage OEO to fund neighborhood-based groups directly when such funding would better serve the purposes of the program. Provisions were also adopted at Senator KENNEDY's suggestion to encourage the prime sponsor to delegate the operation of program components to neighborhood based groups.

Changes were made at the Senator's request, in the language authorizing the legal services program, to assure greater flexibility in providing constructive legal assistance to the poor.

The special impact program authority which Senators KENNEDY and JAVITS coauthored last year was, at the initiative of Senator KENNEDY, revised to assure that the programs funded would be large enough and involve the kinds of activities so as to be capable of having a special impact on communities where they are adopted.

It was also Senator KENNEDY's proposal which resulted in the revision of the welfare assistance provisions of the act in order to achieve more equitable arrangements for welfare recipients and to enable poverty program participants to retain a more realistic portion of their public assistance.

Senator KENNEDY was the author of S. 1789, which authorizes VISTA and the Teacher Corps to work with prisoners and parolees in offering them greater educational opportunity. That legislation was closely related to the bill now before the Senate, and language was adopted to incorporate the substance of that bill in S. 2388.

Finally, and most important, the junior Senator from New York is in fact the coauthor of title II of S. 2388, the Emergency Employment Act. His assistance in working out the provisions of the emergency employment program was of great value to me and to the other cosponsors of this program.

Again I thank the junior Senator from New York for all his help and support in connection with this legislation.

#### PROPOSED SPEAKING ENGAGEMENT OF PRIME MINISTER IAN SMITH, OF RHODESIA, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Washington Post reported today that Prime Minister Ian Smith, of Rhodesia, would need a British passport in order to secure a U.S. visa so that he could fulfill a speaking engagement at the University of Virginia. It is the facts behind this report that I shall speak about today.

Mr. Rosewell Page, Jr., president of the University of Virginia legal forum, invited Ian Smith to address his group because Prime Minister Smith had not been afforded a forum in this country.

Has the time arrived in this country when we are afraid to permit people to speak, even in an academic forum, if we know they have opinions differing from those of our Government? That time must never come. The very essence of the first amendment to the Constitution is

that Americans have the right to hear conflicting opinions. Nothing shall interfere with wide open debate on public affairs and international affairs. The one thing, above all others, that has set us up as a country to be emulated is the fact that an individual or group can speak out strongly in opposition to a policy of our Government.

Prime Minister Ian Smith is singularly qualified to speak on the complex question of Rhodesian independence and no redtape or semantic gimmicks set up by the State Department should be permitted to confuse the basic issue.

The United States has declared economic sanctions against Rhodesia, a nation at peace; its crime, if it be a crime, is that it seeks independence from Great Britain—just as did the United States 191 years ago.

Rhodesia is not at war with the United States, such as is North Vietnam—against which country we have not sought economic sanctions.

Should Prime Minister Ian Smith have an opportunity to present Rhodesia's case to the American people?

I feel, Mr. President, that Prime Minister Ian Smith should be heard.

If our Government's reasons for its present policy toward Rhodesia are sound, then the American people will know both sides and will be in a better position to support their government. Many Americans are not now convinced that our Government's attitude toward Rhodesia is either wise or sound.

Let me say, in closing, that I do not know of a more appropriate forum for Prime Minister Ian Smith to discuss the independence of his country from Great Britain than at the University of Virginia, which was founded by Thomas Jefferson who wrote the Declaration of Independence.

Again, I express my appreciation to the Senator from New York for permitting me to make these remarks at this time.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, may I make a comment on the remarks just made by the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I would be very happy to hear the Senator's comments.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I would hope, also, that Prime Minister Ian Smith would be permitted to come to the United States, and I hope that arrangements for him to do so will be worked out.

I understand that the problem concerns a British passport but I would hope that, somehow, it would be arranged so that Prime Minister Ian Smith will be able to come to this country and go to the University of Virginia to speak.

As I am sure the Senator from Virginia knows, I went to law school there. We listened to representatives who had different points of view. They spoke both at the law school and at the college.

I think it is extremely important in all universities and colleges in this country that the students hear different points of view, whether they agree or disagree with them.

While I disagree with the Senator from Virginia, I happen to support our Government's policy so far as Rhodesia is concerned. I also happen to feel that Prime Minister Ian Smith has

performed a disservice for the people of Rhodesia. However, I think it is elementary in this country that those who have a different point of view from ours, as well as those who have a point of view which might be more in accordance with our own, should be permitted to speak, and that debate and discussion should take place.

As the Senator from Virginia has stated, there is no place more appropriate than a university campus and no university more appropriate than the University of Virginia to invite Prime Minister Ian Smith to speak to them.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Senator from New York, who disagrees with me on the matter of Rhodesia, does agree thoroughly that the Prime Minister should have the opportunity to present his point of view. It is appropriate that he should come to the University of Virginia.

It is well to point out that the Senator from New York is one of the most distinguished of all the very distinguished men and women who have graduated from the University of Virginia Law School.

I am very happy that he joins me—even though we are in disagreement on the general issue here—in expressing the hope that our Government will find appropriate means to permit Prime Minister Ian Smith to come to the United States to explain to the American people his position, although it is a position contrary to that taken by our Government.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE ANTIDUMPING CODE—AN EXAMPLE OF EXECUTIVE "REPEAL" OF STANDING LAW

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on July 25, 1967, I sent my congressional colleagues a letter detailing my concern with the Antidumping Code signed in Geneva on June 30, 1967. This code clearly is an attempt to amend and emasculate an act of Congress by Executive fiat.

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] responded to my letter on the Senate floor on August 23. At that time, I promised a detailed reply to his remarks. The senior Senator from New York expressed his view as to the reasonableness and fairness of the legal standards adopted by the Antidumping Code. But the first issue to be dealt with—an issue of fundamental importance—is not what the legal standards should be, but rather who, under our constitutional form of government, is responsible for determining that standard. In enacting a given standard of the Antidumping Act of 1921 into law, Congress has spoken. At the very least, Congress should have



a say in any substantive amendment of that act. No employee in the executive department can be permitted to alter the will of Congress expressed in law. No single Senator's view as to the reasonableness of a particular amendment can purify and make legal an illegal effort to achieve such an amendment of a congressional statute by executive "legislation."

Mr. President, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] concedes that there is basis for a "very serious difference of view on this important matter." But he would have Congress defer to the courts for its resolution. The senior Senator from Indiana respectfully suggests to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that there is no provision for an appeal to the courts by a domestic industry on this issue. There is no provision in the present Antidumping Act that permits a domestic industry or complainant to appeal to the U.S. Court of Customs the crucial issues involved here—injury and industry determinations under the act. This is a defect in the present act, I might add, which my own antidumping bill, S. 1726, would remedy. Furthermore, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia recently held in *Northern American Cement Corp. v. Anderson*, 284 F. 2d 591 (D.C. Cir. 1960), that the Court of Customs has exclusive jurisdiction over all antidumping matters. Surely the importer who benefits by the emasculation of the 1921 act—who, indeed, is invited by the code to dump his goods in the United States with complete license—cannot be relied upon to test the validity of his new advantage. A court test is impossible.

There is a more basic reason, however, why the Senator's suggestion is inadequate. We in Congress have an affirmative responsibility to uphold the separation of powers spelled out in the Constitution. We cannot and must not idly suffer the usurpation of congressional power by the executive branch. The principle is crucial. If we tolerate this abuse, what law can be safe from executive repeal?

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] stated that he would share my concern if he thought the code were mandatory. He is under the impression, however, that the code is merely "interpretive." Before discussing this matter I should like to clear up one matter.

The antidumping law is a regulation of the unfair trade practice of dumping. A foreign producer need merely lower his price in his home market to escape its sanctions completely. Surely Senator JAVITS' implicit characterization of this law as a protectionist trade barrier cannot stand examination. There is no conflict between the Antidumping Act and the liberal trade policy of the United States. Commissioner Clubb, of the U.S. Tariff Commission, articulated this point in a decision handed down this month:

It might be noted in conclusion that the imposition of dumping duties here as provided in the Antidumping Act is consistent with the liberal trade policy of the United States. When the sales at less than fair value have stopped, the dumping finding can be revoked. Thus, the domestic industry is not being protected against the ingenuity or the natural advantages of the foreign

producer. Rather, it is being protected from the effects of a trade practice which Congress has found to be unfair and injurious. Cast Iron Soil Pipe from Poland, No. AA1921-50, p. 20.

Legislative history makes it quite clear that Congress focused on the problem of domestic economic regulation of unfair competition rather than on any kind of foreign trade issue when it considered antidumping legislation for the first time in 1921.

The legislative history said:

The purpose of the proposed bill (forerunner of the Antidumping Act) is to prevent the stifling of domestic industries by the dumping of foreign merchandise. . . . Over 20 years ago, by the enactment of the Sherman Antitrust Law, Congress recognized the necessity of legislation to prevent unfair methods of competition and monopoly within the United States but effective legislation to prevent discriminations and unfair practices from abroad, to [sic] destroy [sic] competition and control [sic] prices, has not been enacted. H.R. Rep. No. 479, 66th Con., 1st Sess., 1 (1919).

A man who seeks the protection of the law to secure his wife and child at home from the violence of an unlawful intruder is a "protectionist" I suppose. In that sense—and in that sense only—can those who insist on fair competition be classed as "protectionists." But the senior Senator from Indiana cannot believe this is the connotation the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] intended to ascribe.

Mr. President, let me address myself now to the crux of the issue—the substantiality of the inconsistencies between the 1921 act and the code our executive so far has failed to submit to Congress.

Section 201(a) of the act vests the Tariff Commission with authority to determine whether "an industry in the United States is being or is likely to be injured by reason of the importation of dumped merchandise." Article 3 of the code would replace this simple notion of causality with the more difficult, if not impossible, requirement that "dumped imports are demonstrably the principal cause of material injury." Additional language in the code suggests that "principal cause" means that which outweighs the combined importance of all other causes.

Ambassador William Roth, himself, implicitly conceded the substantiality of this change in his statement before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Joint Economic Committee on July 1 of this year. In discussing the need for modifying the impossible-to-meet "major cause" standard in the adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act, Ambassador Roth makes the point, as strongly and ably as anyone could, as to the devastating impact of the almost identically impossible "principal cause" standard in the Antidumping Code. I quote from his statement as printed in the State Department Bulletin of August 7, 1967 at page 174:

Unfortunately, however, the adjustment assistance provisions have not had the expected beneficial effect, because in practice the present test of eligibility to apply for the assistance has proved too strict. In fact, in no case brought under the act have any firms or workers been able to prove eligibility.

The present test of eligibility requires (1)

that tariff concessions be shown to be the major cause of increased imports and (2) that such increased imports be shown to be the major cause of injury to the petitioner.

In the complex environment of our modern economy, a great variety of factors affect the productive capacity and competitiveness of American producers, making it virtually impossible to single out increased imports as the major cause of injury. In fact, it has usually been impossible to prove that tariff concessions were the major cause of increased imports.

The "principal cause" test used by the code is certainly no less strict than the "major cause" test used in the adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act. Surely, in the "complex environment of our modern economy," it is equally impossible to determine that dumping is "demonstrably the principal cause of material injury." Thus, by his own statements in discussing the adjustment assistance provisions of the Trade Expansion Act, Ambassador Roth necessarily admits that it would be virtually impossible to find injury under article 3 of the code.

Under the causality standard contained in the act the Tariff Commission has determined on numerous occasions that injury to a domestic industry has resulted from dumping. Many such decisions would not have been possible under the code. The most recent example is cast iron soil pipe from Poland where Commissioner Clubb applied a test of causality that required merely that price fluctuations were "at least in part" due to dumping—AA1921-AA1950, page 19. In this same case Commissioner Sutton also found causality applying a far less strict standard than that found in the code. He did not insist that dumping be demonstrably the principal cause of material injury and outweigh the combined importance of all other causes—AA1921-AA1950, page 5. Domestic industry which had some assurance as to the enforcement of fair trade practices under the act would see that assurance vanish under the code for all practical purposes. If this is not amendatory, what is?

The senior Senator from New York believes that this emasculation of the act is reasonable and merely interpretive. Does this mean that the Tariff Commission has acted unreasonably in all of its past determinations of injury? Certainly, such a conclusion could be the only one which one could draw from the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

Who is it that has been enthroned to repeal an act of Congress? It is preposterous to assume that Ambassador Roth could knowingly hold to the position that the code does not amend the act when he clearly demonstrated his understanding that a standard of causality such as that contained in the code would render the act virtually inoperable. To be sure, it would appear that the Ambassador may have been remiss in his responsibilities for staff oversight, but I simply cannot ascribe such inconsistency to a man of his repute; I cannot believe that Ambassador Roth is fully aware of the contents of the code. It is more likely that some assistant took it upon himself to vitiate the express will of Congress. But if such were the case it is insufferable. It is outrageous that a mere em-



ployee of the executive—who has never come before this Senate for confirmation—would have the audacity to attempt to repeal a law of Congress.

I should like to proceed to discuss some of the other substantive changes made by the code.

The code weakens the act further by adding the qualification of materiality to the statutory requirement of mere injury. The House Ways and Means Committee was sufficiently concerned to strike the same qualifying language from a 1951 administration sponsored bill. An illuminating commentary on this can be found in the recent cast iron soil pipe from Poland case:

In 1951 the Administration sponsored a bill (H.R. 5505) which, if enacted, would have required a finding that a domestic industry was being "materially injured," rather than merely "injured." This provision was stricken by the House Ways and Means Committee which noted in its report that "The Antidumping Act now provides for imposition of antidumping duties when American industries are being 'injured' by certain imports, section 2 as introduced in H.R. 1535 [H.R. 5505 was introduced as a clean bill] would have changed 'injured' to 'materially injured.' The Committee decided not to include this change in the pending bill in order to avoid the possibility that the addition of the word 'materially' might be interpreted to require proof of a greater degree of injury than is required under existing law for imposition of antidumping duties. The Committee decision is not intended to require imposition of antidumping duties upon a showing of frivolous, inconsequential, or immaterial injury. [H.R. Rep. No. 1089, 82nd Cong., 1st Sess. 7 (1951)] The refusal to legislate in 1951 left intact the original injury standard developed thirty years earlier—frivolous, inconsequential, or immaterial injury would not call for application of dumping duties, but anything greater would."

The Tariff Commission in the recent cast iron soil pipe from Poland case applied this standard—it held that injury is anything more than de minimis or a mere trifle.

Now the executive, through the code, is attempting to achieve by fiat exactly that which Congress denied as a statutory amendment—a more rigid standard of injury. If this is not amendatory, what is?

The senior Senator from New York refers to article VI of GATT which does contain the standard of "material injury," but the GATT protocol specifically provides that any inconsistent pre-existing national laws continue in force. Thus, the 1921 Antidumping Act was exempt from the GATT requirements to the extent it was inconsistent.

One of the most clear-cut inconsistencies between the Antidumping Act and the code concerns the imposition and collection of antidumping duties under article 8(e).

I am convinced that this subsection of the code would make it possible for a violating dumper to escape antidumping duties altogether even after there has been both a determination of dumping and a determination of injury to a domestic industry, if the exporter gives adequate assurances that he will cease dumping in the future. Such an escape for a guilty party is not available under the act—the special dumping duty is automatically imposed. This change by

the code is certainly amendatory, not merely interpretative.

As to the code's new definition of "industry," what the senior Senator from New York views as a perfectly consistent and fair interpretation of the act would require completely contrary results in numerous Tariff Commission determinations, under the act, or of injury to a domestic industry. One case should suffice to illustrate the inconsistency. In Portland cement from Sweden, the Commission found injury to a regional market and industry where the limited number of producers selling in the designated regional market sold only between 6.1 and 27.2 percent of their total domestic production there. These producers were clearly fewer than the code requirement of "domestic producers as a whole of the like products." They sold in the designated regional market far less than the code standard of "all or almost all of their production." And the percentage of apparent consumption in the defined market area accounted for by the dumped Swedish imports ranged only between 2.7 and 5.9 percent—clearly injury to far less than the code standard of "all or almost all of the total production of the product in the market as defined." Thus, none of the industry standards set forth in the code were met and therefore there is no conceivable way in which the result in this case could have been the same under the code as it was under the act. The change in a legal standard that is so substantive as to require predictably and absolutely contrary results in identical cases is amendatory. The Swedish case is not unique; there are eight to 10 other cases which would expose this identical basic inconsistency.

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] agrees that any code provisions that would bring about simultaneous investigations into dumping and injury clearly would be inconsistent with the act which specifies that the Tariff Commission shall make a determination of injury only after being advised by Treasury that a dumping price has been found by that agency.

The senior Senator from New York is willing to excuse the obvious inconsistency between the code and the act on this point in two ways, neither of which is very satisfying. He suggests that articles 5 (a) and (b) of the Code merely permit Treasury to revert to a practice of prior years in their simultaneous investigation into "evidence both of dumping and injury." But it was precisely because Congress was dissatisfied with Treasury's prior practice that the act was amended in 1954 so as to transfer the injury determination entirely over to the Tariff Commission.

The second justification of the senior Senator from New York for the inconsistency raises more problems than it resolves. He asserts that since the language in article 5(b), prescribing simultaneous investigation of both dumping and injury, is purely hortatory, there is no binding obligation on the Treasury to so proceed.

The senior Senator from Indiana must admit that the language and drafting of this section of the code as well as of many others is not as precise as it could

be, but what implications flow from a purely hortatory international agreement? If there is no binding obligation on us, obviously there can be no binding obligation on any other signatory nation. If all nations were to ignore this provision, it would be no more tragic than a waste of time and effort. But unfortunately the danger is more serious. It is quite clear that our Treasury, contrary to statutory law, is planning to abide by this code, hortatory or not. After stripping the statutory security of enforced standards of fair competition from our own domestic industry, we have achieved nothing in return.

We are bringing procedural due process to England. Imagine that. That country which fathered our own legal system has brought only one antidumping action in recent years. The Canadians may impose an injury requirement. And, then again, they may not since Parliamentary action is required before their laws can be amended. Of course, as to the simultaneity of dumping and injury determinations, there is no binding obligation on Canada, England, or any other nation.

Mr. President, the executive has adopted a code which repeals an act of Congress and by the admission of Ambassador Roth, himself renders it "virtually impossible" to ever impose antidumping duties. We are assured of nothing in return. The bargain is a poor one; the attempt to bypass the proper role of Congress is an outrage and an affront to every Member of this body.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on August 23 I made an extensive statement in support of the International Antidumping Code.

I had not realized that today Senator HARTKE would make a further statement on the Antidumping Code. Otherwise, I would have been prepared to make a fairly full reply to his remarks. However, preliminarily I wish to make some brief comments on the points which I would like to elaborate at a later time. A reading of Senator HARTKE's comments suggests that he is making perhaps five or six major points.

First, he states rather categorically that there is no basis for an appeal to the courts by a domestic industry on the question of the consistency of the Antidumping Code with the Antidumping Act. In fact, to my knowledge there has never been a court decision on this question. Moreover, I see no reason why section 516(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 would not provide a basis for appeal by domestic industry in a case where, in its judgment, compliance with the code had erroneously lead to the nonimposition of dumping duties.

Second, Senator HARTKE quarrels with my statement concerning protectionism in relation to the Antidumping Act. My basic point has and continues to be that the Antidumping Act like any other piece of legislation in the trade field is susceptible to being applied in a manner contrary to a liberal trade policy. Indeed, the main value of the code lies in the fact that, consistent with the act, the United States and the other major trading countries of the world have agreed to impose antidumping duties consistent with a liberal trade policy.



Third, Senator HARTKE comes to the conclusion that the phrase "the major cause" in the Trade Expansion Act is synonymous with the term "the principal cause" in the Antidumping Code. In fact, the Tariff Commission decisions, as well as the term itself, establish the notion of the cause greater than all other causes. I see no reason why the "principal cause" cannot be that cause greater than any other significant cause. There is a very considerable difference between the two.

Fourth, Senator HARTKE challenges the notion of "material injury" in the code and goes into the legislative history of the Antidumping Act. He fails to note that the Ways and Means Committee was explicitly told that the notion of "material injury" would continue to be used by the Tariff Commission. Senator HARTKE also failed to mention that the Tariff Commission has indeed consistently used the concept "material injury." And moreover, it has done so with explicit reference to article 6 of the GATT.

Fifth, with respect to the concept of industry, Senator HARTKE points to several Tariff Commission decisions which he says are inconsistent with the code. I submit that the question is not the consistency of the code with prior Tariff Commission decisions but with the act itself. Indeed, the Tariff Commission decisions themselves do not have that degree of consistency which would suggest a series of decisions having the force of law. Granted that the code does delimit the discretion of the Tariff Commission, my point is that the standards that the code establishes are both reasonable and consistent with the act.

Sixth, with respect to the question of simultaneity, Senator HARTKE says that it is quite clear that the Treasury Department, contrary to statutory law, is planning to abide by this code, hortatory or not. Senator HARTKE provides no evidence for this rather startling point—a point which I believe is inconsistent with the position, publicly and consistently taken by Secretary Fowler.

#### REPORT OF AN INSPECTION TRIP TO TEXAS IN THE WAKE OF HURRICANE BEULAH

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on Sunday, September 24, I went to Texas with the Flood Control Subcommittee of the House of Representatives Committee on Public Works for an inspection of Hurricane Beulah damage in Texas. This House delegation was composed of Representative ROBERT E. JONES, of Alabama, chairman; Representative JIM WRIGHT, of Texas; Representative RAY ROBERTS, of Texas; Representative JAMES KEE, of West Virginia; Representative DON H. CLAUSEN, of California; Representative ROBERT C. McEWEN, of New York; and Representative JACK H. McDONALD, of Michigan. We were joined in Texas by Representative JOHN YOUNG, of Texas, and Representative ABRAHAM KAZEN, of Texas, and on Monday, the 25th, by Representative ELIGIO DE LA GARZA, of Texas.

We were accompanied by staff members and by agency representatives of various agencies of the U.S. Government,

whose names I will ask be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

This congressional group landed at the Naval air station at Corpus Christi, Tex., on the 24th, and on Monday, September 25, we divided into groups, two helicopter-borne parties inspecting and surveying damage between Corpus Christi and San Antonio, and the other three helicopter groups of us inspecting and surveying damage in the Lower Rio Grande Valley.

On Monday, September 25, in company with other officials, I surveyed damage from a low-flying, circling Army helicopter in the area of North Padre Island, South Padre Island, Raymondville, Los Fresnos, Weslaco, Mission, San Benito, Pharr, and Donna, and numerous smaller towns. And in addition, we landed by helicopter in Port Isabel, where 85 percent of all the buildings had been damaged, and many so destroyed that we could see only the foundations. Port Isabel bore the brunt of the fury of the hurricane when it first entered Texas. At that time, the winds had reached a velocity of 140 to 150 miles an hour.

We also landed at Brownsville, where the waters of the Rio Grande were still rising, and where I conferred with people, of whom Judge Oscar Dancy, county judge, was the leader. And at Rio Grande City, Starr County, we were on the ground. The people with whom I conferred were led by County Judge M. J. Rodriguez and Arnulfo S. Martinez, county school superintendent. At McAllen, Hidalgo County, where the helicopter landed, I conferred with County Judge M. D. Richardson and Paul G. Veale, mayor of McAllen, as leaders of the group.

We were twice in Harlingen on Monday, September 25, inspecting the growing damage and rising waters of Arroyo Colorado from circling, low-flying helicopters, and were on the ground at the sandbag barrier, and surveyed the increasing damage to homes and property at Harlingen.

On Tuesday morning, the 26th, yesterday morning, I inspected damage from a low-flying, circling Army helicopter at North Beach, Corpus Christi, at Fulton, Tex., where a tornado had leveled a path through the town. In numerous places in Fulton, no upright stick of a house was left standing—only the outlines of where it had been, with debris scattered for a long distance away from them. We also inspected from the air Port Aransas, Rockport, Sinton, and landed in the one helicopter in which we were traveling, on a bridge at the city of Three Rivers, which stood above the floodwaters of the Nueces River. The floodwaters completely surrounded the city of Three Rivers, and were up in all the streets and buildings. In Sinton, Tex., a thousand homes are seriously damaged, the thousand being over 50 percent of the homes in the city.

Mr. President, Hurricane Beulah is rated as one of the three most destructive hurricanes in American history. The hurricane had a threefold damaging effect. First, the hurricane itself, with its high winds and torrential wind-driven

rain; second, the tornados spun off from the periphery or outer perimeter of the hurricane, which struck towns and cities and farm areas far away from the center of the hurricane with the winds of greatest velocity; and, third, the water damage caused by rising waters from the torrential rains, rainfall in volume without precedent in that land, in some cases up to 30 inches of rainfall, a total of 20 inches being not uncommon.

Ninety-five tornados were spun off from Hurricane Beulah, a record number, approximately four times as many tornados as have been recorded to have been spun off from the periphery of any hurricane in the past.

It was the damage from these peripheral tornados which destroyed homes in Fulton, Tex., destroyed 85 homes in Sweet Home, Tex., destroyed buildings and killed people in Palacios, Tex.

Hurricane Beulah after a course through the West Indies and across the Yucatan Peninsula of Mexico and then across the Gulf of Mexico, struck the coast of Mexico slightly south of the Rio Grande River on September 19. It crossed shortly into Texas from Mexico near the mouth of the Rio Grande, slightly west of Port Isabel, swept up the Texas coast, bearing to the northwest, a few miles east of San Benito, Harlingen, Sebastian, Lyford, and Raymondville, Tex., and on a northwest track to slightly north of Jim Wells County, slightly north of Alice, Tex., nearly 200 miles northwest of the point of entry over the mainland.

Mr. President, that is approximately 200 miles from where the hurricane entered the State. Unlike the course of most hurricanes, this hurricane turned south and went into Mexico where it blew itself out against the mountains in Mexico, pouring water into the rivers which feed into the Rio Grande.

Hurricane Beulah came over the mainland and over the mouth of the Rio Grande with winds of a velocity of 140 to 150 miles an hour, and was north of Raymondville by 3 p.m. Wednesday, the 20th of September, when the winds had decreased to a velocity of 100 miles an hour. The hurricane was northwest of Alice, Tex., at 5 a.m. on Thursday, the 21st of September, with winds of 65 miles an hour. The hurricane then veered sharply southwestward across Texas on Thursday, the 21st of September, crossing the Rio Grande between Falcon Lake and Laredo, Tex., on the evening of September 21, and entered Mexico, where it dumped vast quantities of water, swelling the streams in Mexico, tributaries to the Rio Grande, and adding to the flood damage in the Rio Grande Valley from Rio Grande City, Starr County, to the Gulf of Mexico and through the Arroyo Colorado at Harlingen and other points.

It is estimated that the hurricane has cost over \$1 billion in Texas. One million people live in the area of damage and loss, which extended as far north as the east boundary line of Matagorda County, more than 200 miles from Brownsville, Tex.

Tens of thousands of people are homeless, crops are destroyed, over half to three-fourths of the citrus crop of the Lower Rio Grande Valley is gone, dairy

cattle are lost, range cattle are drowned, homes are destroyed, cars have washed away, lives have been lost.

Mr. President, that is a disaster for those people and a loss to everyone in the United States. Inevitably people will have to pay more for citrus fruit, orange juice and grapefruit juice. With respect to the dairy industry, they indicate that in some cases 90 percent of the herds will have to be destroyed because of infection that may arise from the flood. It has been impossible to round up the range cattle to determine how many are stranded and how many have drowned, but we do know that many have been drowned. Crops have washed away and land has been destroyed, and lives have been lost.

The great miracle is that so few lives were lost. I believe 11 lives were lost in Texas. Much of the credit, for the small loss of human life goes to the fine Weather Bureau in Texas which warned the people of the location where the hurricane would strike within 10 miles of where the hurricane did strike. It indicated the velocity of the wind, plotted the course, and warned the people of the course that it would take.

The Coast Guard brought in helicopters from as far away as Florida. The Coast Guard put vessels on the outer periphery of the hurricane to measure the aftereffect.

Mr. President, all of these services, the Weather Bureau, the Coast Guard, the Air Force which brought in supplies, the Army with its helicopters, and the Navy with its service, rendered a great service without which hundreds of lives would have been lost, instead of only 11.

In 1900, without the modern weather warning and safety devices, 6,000 lives were lost in a hurricane in Galveston, Tex., in one night. Here, with Hurricane Beulah, with the fine services that have been rendered, only 11 lives have been lost in Texas.

In Port Isabel, of the 5,000 population, all but six people were evacuated, which resulted in saving of many lives. The six who remained rode out the storm.

This is the highest water ever seen at Harlingen, Tex., and many other points we inspected on the ground, at Harlingen in Cameron County, and far north at Three Rivers in Live Oak County. In city after city which we inspected, this was the highest water they had ever experienced. Homes, furnishings, and the total possessions of people except the clothing they could run away with were often lost. The hopes of a lifetime in terms of property, the comforts around people, were shattered. This is a disaster of major proportions.

Mr. President, we saw many fine homes in Harlingen, Tex., ruined by high water. They kept their cars until the last moment in order to save their clothing and then their engines drowned out, some lost their cars as well as their homes and possessions.

Mr. President, last Thursday, September 21, this Senate by unanimous action added to H.R. 9960, by my amendment, \$10 million to the President's disaster relief fund, raising the appropriation from \$15 to \$25 million for fiscal year 1968,

because of the report on the floor of the Senate of damage done in Texas by Hurricane Beulah.

On Friday, September 22, Mr. President, I sent President Lyndon B. Johnson the following telegram:

PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.:

Reports from Texas indicate vast, incalculable, and growing damage from Hurricane Beulah, with succeeding torrential rains of more than thirty inches in some areas of South Texas and the early estimates of five hundred million dollars of damage in South Texas growing hourly, with vast areas of land under water.

I recommend the immediate declaration of South Texas, southeast of San Antonio, including an area as far north as Victoria, as a major disaster area.

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,  
U.S. Senator, Texas.

On Monday, September 25, this week, I received an acknowledgement of that telegram from the White House as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, September 22, 1967.

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: Thank you for your telegram of September 22 to the President urging that he declare the occurrence of a natural disaster in south Texas.

As yet, the President has not received a request from the Governor for a disaster declaration. Representatives of the Office of Emergency Planning are maintaining close and constant contact with the Governor, and I have asked that you be kept fully informed of all developments.

Sincerely,

MIKE MANATOS,  
Administrative Assistant  
to the President.

(At this point, Mr. HARTKE took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, that was Friday the 22d, but there was no request from the Governor of Texas that Texas be declared a disaster area. Senators are familiar with the law which declares that the President technically cannot declare a disaster until the Governor of the State requests it.

As the scope of the disaster widened, I received appeals from public officials in Texas to assist in obtaining the designation of a disaster area.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD telegrams from the following officials: William A. Schmidt, county judge, San Patricio County, Tex.; J. D. Wendell, county judge, Aransas County, Tex.; M. J. Rodriguez, county judge, Starr County, Tex.

The telegrams are dated September 24, 25, and 22, respectively.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAFT, TEX.,  
September 24, 1967.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,  
U.S. Senator,  
U.S. Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

San Patricio County, Tex., needs help. Two thousand homes damaged by Hurricane Beulah flood waters. Please advise.

Regards,

WILLIAM A. SCHMIDT,  
County Judge,  
San Patricio County, Tex.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEX.,  
September 25, 1967.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,  
Washington, D.C.:

L. J. Wood, M.D., county health officer, Aransas County, has advised me that a residential area in Rockport, Tex., and Fulton area has been inundated by wave and rain, action of Hurricane Beulah. This area is not draining and constitutes a real health hazard and an extremely large breeding ground for various pests. This area has roads, yards, and so forth, under 6 to 8 inches of water. Immediate assistance requested.

JOHN D. WENDELL,  
County Judge,  
Aransas County, Tex.

EDINBURG, TEX.,  
September 22, 1967.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,  
U.S. Senator, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GOVERNOR: Kindly designate Starr County as an emergency disastrous area. Your assistance in expediting all available help State and Federal will be greatly appreciated.

M. J. RODRIGUEZ,  
County Judge,  
Starr County,  
Rio Grande City.

(Relayed per sheriff's office, Edinburg, Tex.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, despite these telegrams, and despite numerous requests, the Governor of Texas failed and refused to ask for the declaration of a disaster area. In my lifetime I have never seen, and have never before experienced, a situation where, with a disaster of major proportions raging all around, caused by one of the three most terrible hurricanes in the history of this country, with a billion dollars damage and 1 million people suffering, that a Governor refused to ask for the declaration of a disaster area.

Instead, he traveled around holding hearings to determine the question of when or whether he would ask the President, although 1 million people in south Texas knew there was a disaster. If the Governor did not know it, then he was the only man in the United States who did not know it. He continued to dilly-dally, refusing to heed the appeals.

I received a telephone call from Judge Richardson of Hidalgo County, and numerous other telephone calls, asking for help to get a disaster area declared.

Today, Wednesday, September 27, after returning just last evening from Texas, to take part in proceedings in the Senate today, I received a telephone call from a medical officer, C. H. Spence, medical doctor of Raymondville, the county seat of Willacy County, Tex., which we viewed from the air and which was entirely surrounded by water, with water up in all of the streets and buildings. He telephoned me to say that he was very much concerned about the need to spray the area to kill swarms of mosquitos and flies which he says will soon be developing. He said that unless controlled, there is danger that they will bring in encephalitis and diarrhea to children in shelters there. People had been evacuated by the thousands from the lowlands into churches, schools and public buildings.

Dr. C. H. Spence advised me that he had contacted the Army and requested that they do this spraying, but the of-



ficer of the Army advised Dr. C. H. Spence that they could not do so until the area had been declared a disaster area. Dr. Spence phoned me to ask help to get the sprays going. If the spraying is too long delayed, it might be ineffective in preventing epidemics.

Mr. President, I have issued public appeals in Texas to the Governor of Texas, day after day, to request the President of the United States to declare this south Texas area, the place of residence of 1 million people, a disaster area.

I have been advised that it is on the ticker today that the Governor will ask the President to declare south Texas a disaster area.

To me, the Governor's delay in requesting the President for a declaration of disaster has been inexcusable. We know the numerous laws that are called into play for the relief of the people once an area is declared a disaster area—from the Office of Disaster Loans in the Small Business Administration, the Farmers Home Administration under the Department of Agriculture, with certain loans under the Department of Housing and Urban Development, with public roads-rebuilding powers, and many other branches and offices of Government which can help if a disaster is declared. The local authorities are virtually bankrupt in some of these cities now, with all their facilities destroyed. There are many other branches in Government which can help when a disaster occurs, but not unless the area is first declared to be a disaster area.

By contrast, Mr. President, I point to what happened 2 years ago when Hurricane Betsy struck the States of Florida and Louisiana. The Governors of those States immediately asked that the President declare a disaster area. The President not only declared them so, but flew down there and inspected the damage while the hurricane was still going on.

But this time, with the damage mounting daily, the waters rising, and the constant appeals to the President, no request has yet been made by the Governor for a disaster declaration.

I hope that the rumor that the Governor is sending a disaster request to the President is true. I hope that, after so long a dalliance with this terrible disaster, with the Governor going around and making speeches in the counties in the disaster area, getting information on which, he said, to base an appeal to the President in order to declare a disaster area, that the Governor will finally ask the President to declare one so that we can bring relief to those suffering people, and prevent epidemics for the future.

This is the worst playing politics with a disaster that I can remember in my lifetime. I do not believe that in the past two generations, any American Governor has ever played politics with a disaster and the suffering of his people to the extent that we have witnessed in the past week.

We hope that most of the damage is in the past and that less damage will occur in the future. But the constantly rising waters in the Brownsville and Harlingen areas of Cameron County, from the angry floods of the Rio Grande and the Arroyo Colorado warn us that more losses are still to come.

This is a low, flat, coastal plain. The land is waterlogged. The waters are receding very slowly, even where they are falling, and every day adds to the loss in Three Rivers, in Raymondville, in Harlingen, and in numerous smaller towns.

Mr. President, when I was on the ground at Three Rivers early yesterday morning, the waters had been very high. A helicopter went over the area and landed on a bridge immediately over the water. A sheriff showed us a benchmark where the water had fallen only 8 inches in 24 hours.

Everyone knows what muddy floodwaters can do to a house. Plywood furniture, whether cheap or expensive, comes apart. Sofas are ruined. Walls fall in. Bedding becomes waterlogged, and smells, and is ruined and cannot be rebuilt. This disaster was not something that happened quickly. It continued day after day. People were calling for relief. Yet no action was taken by the Governor to ask for a disaster declaration.

I know of no modern instance where the Governor of an American State, in the face of a natural disaster so overwhelming, has so long failed his people, and failed to ask for a declaration of a disaster area. It is tragic for the 1 million people of southeast Texas that this declaration has not been asked for, officials and county judges.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of the surveying party which went to Texas on Sunday, when the House Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works, when they and I and others, surveyed the damage. Some of the most knowledgeable men in American Government who had worked with these problems for some 10 to 30 years were along on that trip, and it enabled us to make a thorough examination of the area.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL SUBCOMMITTEE, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, INSPECTION OF HURRICANE DAMAGE, TEXAS, SEPTEMBER 24 TO 27, 1967

#### Washington party

#### CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

Congressman Robert E. Jones, of Alabama, Chairman.

Congressman Jim Wright, of Texas.

Congressman Ray Roberts, of Texas.

Congressman James Kee, of West Virginia.

Congressman Don H. Clausen, of California.

Congressman Robert C. McEwen, of New York.

Congressman Jack H. McDonald, of Michigan.

Special Guest: Senator Ralph Yarborough, of Texas.

Robert F. Spence, Professional Staff Member, Committee on Public Works (Majority).

Paul R. S. Yates, Professional Staff Member, Committee on Public Works (Minority).

Marshall L. Lynam, Administrative Assistant to Congressman Jim Wright.

Ronald Clower, Legislative Aide to Senator Ralph Yarborough.

Bill Hamilton, Press Aide to Senator Ralph Yarborough.

#### AGENCY REPRESENTATIVES

Ambassador Raymond Telles, Chairman, U.S. Section, United States-Mexican Border Development Commission.

Melbourne L. Spector, Executive Director,

United States-Mexican Border Development Commission.

Lt. Col. William R. Needham, Office of the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army.

Major Raleigh N. Williams, Jr.

Robert Y. Phillips, Director, Emergency Operations Office, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President.

Stephen Tripp, Disaster Relief Coordinator, Department of State/AID.

Franklin P. Hall, special assistant to Dwight Ink.

George Walter, Deputy Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture.

Dr. (Adm.) John Walsh, U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dwight Ink, Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Harry A. L. Lindberg, Chief of Construction and Maintenance Division, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Transportation.

Francis Turner, Director, Bureau Public Roads.

Clarence "Bud" Cowles, Director, Office of Disaster Loans, Small Business Administration.

E. V. Bighinatti, Assistant National Director, Disaster Services, American Red Cross.

#### To join group in Texas

Congressman Klka de la Garza, of Texas.

Congressman Abraham Kazen, of Texas.

Congressman John Young, of Texas.

George Hastings, Regional Director, Office of Emergency Planning.

Edward J. Gulley, Deputy National Director, Disaster Services, American Red Cross.

Hon. Joseph F. Friedkin, U.S. Commissioner, United States-Mexican International Boundary and Water Commission.

#### RED CROSS WORKS HARD TO AID FLOOD AND HURRICANE VICTIMS IN SOUTH TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a preliminary report from the American Red Cross, which has been notable among those doing a magnificent job in relieving the suffering of the citizens of Texas from the effects of a greater disaster. This is in the form of a letter to me, dated September 25, from Gen. James F. Collins, U.S. Army, retired.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS, Washington, D.C., September 25, 1967.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Since Hurricane Beulah first threatened the Texas Gulf Coast, hundreds of trained local Red Cross volunteers assisted by disaster staff from many parts of the country have been hard at work meeting emergency needs and preparing for the long-term job of helping Texas hurricane and flood victims recover from the disaster. The American Red Cross Hurricane Action plan was put into effect on September 17th, as soon as the Weather Bureau indicated the threat to the Texas coast. Red Cross operational headquarters were activated in Houston and the nine operational districts responsible for the coastal area were staffed. Eighty-five Red Cross disaster specialists went to assist over 4,600 Red Cross chapter volunteers and staff in the threatened area. They were supported by thirty-six mobile disaster units and 5,000 cots and 10,000 blankets borrowed from the United States Public Health Service.

Beginning on Tuesday, September 19th, Red Cross shelters in an area from Brownsville north to Houston, west to Austin and south to Laredo began housing evacuees.

This grew to a peak of 295 shelters housing over 114,000 evacuees and nearly a quarter of a million rescue workers and victims were fed by Red Cross. The torrential rains that accompanied the hurricane caused considerable additional damage and prevented people returning to coastal areas. As of September 23rd, there were 110,800 people in 223 Red Cross shelters; over the weekend, the total dropped to slightly over 50,000 still in 133 shelters in 38 locations. The Red Cross was still feeding approximately 100,000 people over the weekend. When the flood gate opened at Mercedes, an additional five shelters were opened at Harlingen to care for about 600 additional evacuees.

As of this writing, there is still the possibility of additional flooding for new rains which have occurred. A total of 110 disaster staff are now on the job, along with 5,000 volunteers. They are working closely with local, state and federal officials to see that all needed emergency help is given to flood evacuees from Texas communities and those Mexican evacuees who have crossed the border to safety.

The Red Cross will remain on the job to help bridge the gap between what these families can do for themselves and the essential help they need over and beyond their own resources as they strive to return to normal living once the waters have receded.

In order to help you answer any questions which may come to you from residents of your state, I am enclosing a pamphlet, "In the Wake of Disaster", which outlines the Red Cross program now in effect in Texas. I will keep you informed of the progress of our relief efforts, and will, of course, be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

JAMES F. COLLINS,  
General, U.S. Army, Retired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I want to pay personal tribute to the Red Cross and to the Salvation Army. They put plans into effect before the hurricane got there. They were ready with food and clothing. As mass evacuations were undertaken relief agencies moved in with giant soup kitchens. They fed tens of thousands of people, when we add up all the places where food was served.

I want to pay tribute to the 4th Army and General Stilwell of the 1st Army Division at Fort Hood, who offered important helicopter help. When I saw the skill of those pilots in maneuvering and the places at which they landed and how close they came to the rooftops, I said to the general, "These are the most skilled helicopter pilots I have ever seen. I have been in helicopters in Korea and other places." I said, "They must have been in combat." He said, "Everyone who flies one of these helicopters has been engaged in Vietnam except those who have just graduated from school." He said, "Many of them have served two or three tours of duty." They are actually in combat 10 months and come back home. Several of them had served several tours of duty in Vietnam.

We all appreciate the service rendered us by them, and by the other military services, and by the Red Cross and the Salvation Army. I hope the wire reports are correct that the President will make an aerial inspection. I hope it proves to him that it is a disaster and that it will be declared a disaster area and that the million people suffering from this giant disaster will receive much needed assistance.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I share, of course, the concern of my distinguished colleague for what has happened in Texas and for the people in Texas who have suffered from that disaster. Although there is not much I can add to or improve on what he has said, because he has given a comprehensive report on it, I would like to add a few remarks of my own.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. My colleague the junior Senator from Texas was in Texas when I offered the amendment last Wednesday. The junior Senator from Texas telephoned the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who brought his message in, asking that my amendment adding \$10 million be adopted, and he pleaded that his colleagues on that side of the aisle join in support of the amendment. It was carried unanimously in the Senate on Thursday the 21st. I want to thank the Senator for enlisting the support of his party in support of that motion.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator and wish to express my personal appreciation for his taking the initiative in offering the amendment, which was constructive and helpful. It was a good morale factor at a time when the people there were feeling pretty low. I imagine they are feeling even lower now.

I note by the news ticker that the President plans to make an aerial inspection of the flood and hurricane damage in Texas and Mexico tomorrow afternoon. I hope that will result in helping him to decide to declare it a disaster area.

Mr. President, in terms of dollar damage, Hurricane Beulah is probably the worst natural disaster ever to hit Texas. Floods that have resulted from the backlash of the hurricane have, of course, done more damage than the hurricane itself.

As far as damage in dollars is concerned, it has been called Billion-Dollar Beulah. It will take a while to get cleaned up enough to accurately assess the ultimate cost. The Office of Emergency Planning, vested with the power to conduct and marshal Federal aid to an area declared officially a national disaster one, can now move ahead officially with its effort. Governor Connally has just requested the President to declare our hardest hit South Texas counties as disaster areas.

I have talked this afternoon with Governor Connally, and I fully support his request to the President. I have placed my Senate office at the Governor's disposal and will cooperate with him and every other Texas official in every possible way in efforts to ameliorate the damage and suffering.

I was pleased to have the Governor's report that his detailed, but still preliminary, surveys of the situation lead him to hope that initial estimates of damage to public facilities may not be as substantial as originally feared.

I am pleased to report that as of today three Air Force aircraft have been dispatched from Langley Field in Virginia to the Naval Air Station at Corpus Christi for the purpose of necessary,

massive aerial spraying operations, as clouds and clouds of mosquitoes have been reported. The craft will load insecticides at Corpus Christi and at Randolph Field in San Antonio and hope to cover a million acres tomorrow.

One of the problems is that no useful spraying can be done in areas where the high waters are still running. In those areas the spray is simply washed away before it can be very effective. However, by tomorrow it will be possible to spray effectively in Aransas, Willacy, and Hidalgo Counties. And, hopefully by another day Cameron, Starr, Wilson, Nueces, San Patricio, Goliad, Jim Wells, Victoria, Live Oak, and Atascosa Counties can be covered.

Certainly our civil defense personnel have done an excellent job in assisting in the affected areas. Individual and group efforts have been outstanding. For example, hundreds of volunteers in McAllen, Tex., have manned the sandbag line. Community spirit and community initiative, despite the gravity of the situation, is exceedingly high. The enterprising McAllen residents are utilizing portions of their freeway system as a bulwark against high water.

Several Federal agencies have already been of assistance. The Small Business Administration is doing its usual excellent job. The cities of Victoria and Port Lavaca will receive housing and urban development water and sewer grants totaling some \$1,900,500 to assist in building needed facilities and to help the speedy recovery from the damage done by the hurricane. A \$1,500,000 grant to Victoria will be used to help in construction of a water system and improve the existing sewer system. A grant of \$400,500 to Port Lavaca will be used to extend water and sewer services to low-income residential neighborhoods.

A new Port Isabel post office, on which construction was not scheduled until February 1 of next year, will be started, instead, just as soon as possible. Such assistance, while certainly minor compared to the overall picture, is most helpful to these respective communities involved.

Mr. President, as I have noted earlier, one of the most beneficial pieces of legislation to come before the Senate this year was the recently passed National Flood Insurance Act of 1967. The bill's main thrust will be to assist victims of flood and hurricane damage where their homes and businesses and other properties have been destroyed, as well as helping to alleviate the future risk of flood and hurricane losses in situations where the risk of loss exceeds the prospect of gain from use of the site.

In 1965 alone, an estimated loss of over \$700 million resulted from damage by inland floods. Since the beginning of the 20th century, flood damage has increased about 5 percent per year. The population of our country, however, has risen only 2 percent per year.

We in Texas have experienced some tragic natural disasters. Six years ago, Texas experienced widespread devastation resulting from the onslaught of Hurricane Carla. This rampaging hurricane left an estimated \$225 million worth of



damage; 34 people died; 465 persons were injured, and an estimated 250,000 citizens were evacuated from their homes to escape the destruction of the hurricane.

Then this year there was Hurricane Beulah. Obviously, no statistics can fully register the economic loss and disruption resulting from such flood and hurricane damage. When rivers or coastal waters are rampaging, nearby urban areas, such as Galveston, Beaumont, Port Arthur, Brownsville, Corpus Christi, and others, suffer tremendously. Industries are halted in production. Transportation and communication facilities are damaged or become inoperative. And most of all, the lives and money of thousands of people are endangered.

The first national flood protection policy was inaugurated over 30 years ago. Since then the Federal investment in flood protection and prevention has amounted to more than \$7 billion. Much of this work has been accomplished by the Corps of Engineers and the Soil Conservation Service. The current rate for such expenditures is around \$500 million a year.

As is the case in many other areas, Federal Government programs have not provided the ultimate and total cure of the problem. There are limitations under the special Federal assistance programs on the amount of money available at any one time to meet such natural emergencies. The most important type of assistance to disaster victims are loans from the Small Business Administration. But often these loans leave the victims with considerable mortgage obligations.

Unfortunately, flood insurance is not usually available from private insurance companies. The reason is that private insurers have not been able to write flood insurance policies on an economically feasible basis.

This new Senate bill combines the talents and resources of the Federal Government with the initiative and aid of private enterprise in the insurance industry.

With a helping hand from the Government, private insurance companies could either assume a portion of the risk in carrying out the program or could participate on a nonrisk basis. Insurance companies would commit risk capital to an industry pool of companies which would absorb a share of the losses and expenses of the program.

The Federal Government would make premium equalization payments to the pool to cover losses and would also provide insurance coverage to the pool to counteract any excessively high losses.

This legislation also encourages State and local governments to adopt and enforce appropriate land use provisions. Such provisions would discourage the future development of land which is exposed to flood hazard. A long range effect of this bill encourages a study to determine the extent to which insurance protection may be available for certain other types of natural disasters, such as earthquakes.

Thus the Flood Insurance Act of 1967 is an important step in the right direction: the bill fosters a partnership of

local, State, and Federal resources. These combined efforts will work to help solve a natural problem common to every State and region in our America and of particular importance to Texans.

Mr. President, I would like to review just briefly the Senate's previous action in disastrous situations, in the absence of an acceptable approach to a Government-assisted flood insurance program.

Additional efforts were made by the Federal Government in 1966 to help the victims of such disasters as that which has devastated this large portion of Texas in the last several days.

As ranking minority member of the Small Business Subcommittee at that time, I gave my complete support to whatever help was legislatively available under the Small Business Act.

Our committee effort made it possible for the SBA Administrator, under such disaster conditions, to extend the maturity of existing small business loans in the ravaged areas and to suspend the payment of interest and principal for as long as 5 years.

In addition, we extended to 30 years the maturity for loans to homeowners for the repair or replacement of homes and to business owners to repair or replace damaged or destroyed plants and equipment.

In that same action, we made certain that disaster victims who would qualify for such SBA assistance would never be left stranded due to the lack of SBA funds for such purposes. We removed the ceiling from disaster funds because we had learned from Hurricane Betsy that disasters could not be realistically anticipated.

Mr. President, I have myself been in the disaster area. I was there when the full force of the hurricane hit. I sat at a ranch in the southern part of Texas and saw hackberry trees blow across the fields like cornstalks.

I assured those many fine citizens I came in contact with, that the Nation was concerned about our area, and, that I was certain my colleagues would be of assistance in extending any further needed aid.

I commend both the Governor of Texas and my senior colleague who, I understand, has just recently been in the area himself, for their individual efforts to give the utmost assistance to the people of Texas. I will, of course, cooperate with both our Governor and my senior colleague in the best interests of my State and its people.

Beulah is a disaster of massive proportions. Not since the Alaskan earthquake has any of our States been so grievously injured. It is a time when all Texans must unite behind the determined goal of assistance to our stricken southern counties. It is a time when Texans must ask their neighboring States and, indeed, the entire United States, to come to our assistance with compassion.

We need help. We need food, clothing, medicine, and construction materials for homes, businesses, highways, and public services.

We extend our thanks to all Americans

who have in the past generously supported the Red Cross; we ask that this support be increased and continued so that the Red Cross can redouble its fine assistance to Texans and our Mexican neighbors. We extend our thanks to Congress which has helped provide our State with many flood-control projects; and we ask that this help be further extended in this time of need to include emergency funds for reconstruction loans and for rebuilding grants.

Texas is a proud State. Almost everyone thinks of us as the Lone Star State. But we are not alone in this time of trouble. We already are being helped by thousands of volunteers from all over the United States.

We appreciate that. We could not do without it. We humbly ask for more such help. And whenever other States suffer natural disasters, they can count on Texans to reciprocate the goodwill we receive today.

For the long term, it appears obvious that we are going to have to considerably improve and strengthen our flood-control program for the Rio Grande Valley. Present systems were prepared to take care of the largest floods envisioned—but we were wrong in estimating the flooding potential of storms such as Beulah. The Arroyo Colorado system will have to be rebuilt and further flood-control projects and dams will have to be built anew if we are to control future flood threats and prevent the millions of dollars of damage we have suffered this time.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 28, 1967, at 12 noon.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, September 27, 1967:

##### IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of captain in the line, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Adams, Frank M.	Ames, Lionel E., Jr.
Adelman, Joseph L.	Amme, Richard D.
Aicklen, William J., Jr.	Anderson, Charles R.
Aiken, Robert A.	Anderson, James L.
Akins, Joseph W., Jr.	Ansel, David D.
Alberta, Edward T.	Appert, Edward P.
Alexander,	Atkins, Waldo A.
Charles S., Jr.	Atkinson, Roy C.
Alford, Zeb D.	Ayres, James E.

Babineau, Francis E.	Crane, John W., Jr.	George, Robert McL.	Krejcarek, Donald J.	Pace, Robert D., Jr.	Spangenberg, Walter, Jr.
Bach, Nicholas R.	Craven, Phillip R.	Gideon, Robert A., Jr.	Lakey, Keith G.	Packer, Duncan	Spann, Willis L.
Bacon, Francis W., Jr.	Cresman, Jesse C.	Ginn, Benjamin F.	Lansden, Humphrey B.	Paddock, Richard A.	Spoon, Donald D.
Bade, Robert B.	Crispin, Robert E.	Gokey, Noah W., III	Larcombe, Howard N. Jr.	Palmer, Frederick F.	Spy, Warren L.
Bagwell, Wallace B.	Crockett, Charles B., Jr.	Goldman, Peter J.	Larsen, Norman E.	Parish, George R., Jr.	Stanfield, Henry L.
Bailey, Daniel L.	Cross, William E.	Gormley, Robert H.	Lasseter, Joe F., Jr.	Pavelle, John J., Jr.	Stanley, Hilton L.
Bailey, Emera S.	Crowe, William J., Jr.	Grantham, Delbert D.	Lee, Harry B.	Payne, William E., Jr.	Stensrud, John D.
Banks, Daniel L., Jr.	Cummings, Charles W.	Gravely, Samuel L., Jr.	Lee, Robert E.	Pehrsson, Pehr H.	Stevens, Jack M.
Barber, Albertus V., Jr.	Cummings, Edward M., Jr.	Green, Norman K.	Lemeschewsky, Andrew A.	Perry, Dale S.	Stillwell, Edward P.
Barksdale, David A.	Cummins, Peter P.	Greene, Wallace A.	Lewis, Chantee	Perszyk, Joseph S., Jr.	Stockdale, James B.
Barnes, Alan F.	Curtin, Lawrence J.	Grove, George S.	Lewis, John C.	Peters, Bernard	Stone, Robert S.
Barondes, Earl D.	Dallmann, Paul H.	Groves, Thomas E.	Lewis, William S.	Pfeiffer, Willard D.	Stone, Troy E.
Barr, Robert M., Jr.	Darcy, Robert T.	Guertin, Louis H.	Lindgren, George B.	Phelps, Henry E.	Strayve, Jerome R.
Barry, James H.	Davies, James W.	Gygax, Rex	Loranger, Donold	Phillips, Kenneth E.	Strong, James T.
Baughman, Fred H.	Davis, Cabell S., Jr.	Haizlip, John W., Jr.	Lowans, Warren H.	Pickert, Aloysius J., Jr.	Swainson, Gustav F., Jr.
Baxter, James A.	Davis, Ray E.	Hallam, Orval K.	Lyon, Henry J.	Pittman, Shelly B.	Tarpey, John F.
Beck, Lester H.	Davis, Theodore F.	Hallett, Oliver S.	Macomber, Mark M.	Pomeroy, Leslie K., Jr.	Tate, Hugh J.
Becker, Karl E.	Debaets, Donald J.	Hancock, David L.	Macon, Benjamin H.	Powell, Robert A.	Taylor, David J.
Becker, Terrill F.	Deffenbaugh, Robert M.	Hankins, Wallace W., Jr.	Magee, William C.	Prassinis, George	Taylor, Dean, Jr.
Bell, John H.	Deganahl, James A.	Harkins, William D.	Manganaro, Francis F.	Prichard, Reuben P., Jr.	Teasley, William A., Jr.
Benson, Harry L.	Demayo, John J., Jr.	Harper, John R.	Maragos, George	Purcell, Stephen E., Jr.	Tedholm, Charles E.
Bernstein, Fred J.	Denkler, John M.	Harris, William H.	March, George P.	Rae, William C., Jr.	Terrass, Milford S.
Bihl, Richard A.	Denton, Jeremiah A., Jr.	Hart, Harry S.	Martin, Barney	Rank, Cyrus A.	Terry, Harold L.
Bivin, Homer R.	Deveas, Thomas E.	Harvey, Donald P.	Marvin, Stephen D.	Rasmussen, John E.	Thede, William L.
Black, Charles H.	Dewenter, John R., Jr.	Hathaway, Charles E.	Maurer, Richard C., Jr.	Rauch, Charles F., Jr.	Thomas Edward W.
Blair, Richard E.	Dibble, Henry M.	Hattersley, Julian	Mawhiney, William T.	Rawlins, Robert D.	Thummel, Gerald F.
Blixt, Melvin D.	Dickleson, Robert W.	Haupt, Richard W.	Maxwell, Robert A.	Readdy, Francis J.	Thurtell, Frank A.
Boushee, Frank L.	Diffendorfer, Carl J.	Haynes, Kenneth G.	Maynard, Allison L.	Rectanus, Earl F.	Timidalski, James T.
Bouwman, Fredric G.	Donaldson, Charles E., III	Henderson, James R.	McClinton, Robert B.	Reese, Walter H.	Toohill, Donald L.
Bowen, James W.	Donovan, James A.	Herrick, Carl H.	McConnell, John H., Jr.	Regan, William F.	Train, Harry D., II
Brabant, Robert J.	Douglass, Robert M.	Herzog, James H.	McCook, John A.	Reichwein, Fremont E.	Trott, Robert J.
Bradley, Claiborne S.	Douglass, Walter M.	Hilton, Robert P.	McCracken, William H.	Reilly, Jeremiah D., Jr.	Trout, Roscoe L.
Bradshaw, Ray H.	Drake, John F.	Hinden, Harry J.	McCrory, Robert D.	Rex, James F.	Tucker, Ralph M.
Brand, Richard G.	Durkin, Michael F.	Hinds, Charles D.	McDaniel, William O.	Reynolds, Milton L.	Ulbricht, Frederick W.
Brenner, Thomas B.	Early, Paul J.	Hinkle, William L.	McDonald, Carlton A. K.	Rich, Harold G.	Underwood, John L., Jr.
Briggs, Winston D.	Ebel, Stanley T.	Hodder, Arthur J., Jr.	McDonald, Nathan F.	Riehl, Julian W., Jr.	Urban, Henry, Junior
Brittain, Thomas B., Jr.	Edwards, George D., Jr.	Hoffman, Richard A.	McDonald, William M.	Rigot, William L.	Urbanczyk, Louis T., Jr.
Bromley, Frederick B.	Elkas, Claude P., Jr.	Hoffmann, Henry A.	McDonald, Wesley L.	Riley, Daniel P.	Vail, Malcolm E.
Brooke, Rupert	Ekelund, Kenneth O., Jr.	Hoffmann, Roy F.	McGill, John C., Jr.	Riley, Edward E.	Vansickle, John R.
Broughton, Walter T., II	Eldridge, Richard A.	Holden, William P.	McGonagle, William L.	Roberts, Lona R., Jr.	Vantuyt, Andrew J.
Brown, Bryan B., Jr.	Elefante, Frank L.	Holland, John P.	McKenzie, William W., Jr.	Robertson, William D., Jr.	Vermilya, Robert S.
Brown, Floyd H.	Ellis, Samuel S.	Holm, Kenneth C.	McLaughlin, Norman H.	Robinson, Winthrop P.	Volk, Ralph L., Jr.
Brubaker, Donald E.	Elmer, Joseph S.	Holshouser, Jesse A., Jr.	McMahon, James P.	Roche, Robert F.	Rockcastle, Charles H.
Brumbaugh, Dale C.	Enright, Robert E.	Holton, Wallace C.	McNamara, Thomas W.	Rodgers, Hollis T.	Rodgers, Harry M.
Bryant, Bobby D.	Evans, Jack E.	Hoover, Lloyd N.	Miko, Charles R.	Rogers, Harry M.	Ross, Royal R., Jr.
Buck, Edward G.	Evans, Joseph D.	Houck, Donald F.	Miller, William O.	Ross, Seymour L.	Russell, Wallace L.
Bulmer, Robert W.	Fargo, Robert R.	Howard, Donnell	Milligan, Donald F.	Russell, William M.	Ruxton, Robert T., Jr.
Burkart, John C.	Farley, Russell J.	Howard, John N.	Mitchell, Eugene B.	Ryder, Donald F.	Sabin, Nelson
Burke, Edwin J.	Farris, George W.	Hudner, Thomas J., Jr.	Mitchell, Frank A.	Sanders, James E.	Sante, Robert D.
Caine, Arthur D.	Farshing, Donald D., Jr.	Hume, David M.	Mitchell, John E.	Sapp, Earle W.	Schaefer, William M.
Callaway, John D., Jr.	Fay, Lawrence J.	Hunter, "H" Reid	Monger, Albert J.	Schniedwind, Robert F.	Scoggins, Marvin C., Jr.
Campbell, Richard D.	Fenn, Richard W.	Hunter, Perry F., III	Morgan, Clifford L.	Scott, Benedict J.	Scott, Robert L.
Carlquist, Roger	Fenwick, Joseph E.	Irwin, Charles M., Jr.	Morgan, Newton H.	Searl, Floyd C.	Shaver, William M.
Carman, Warren E.	Fine, Stanley S.	Jackson, Thomas E.	Morgiewicz, Daniel J.	Shelton, John P.	Shelton, John P.
Carment, Frederick, Jr.	Finneran, John G.	Jacobs, Richard B.	Morris, Max K.	Short, Edward A.	Shugart, Kenneth L., Jr.
Carpenter, Harold L.	Fischer, David W.	Jefferson, Harry P.	Moss, James L.	Simons, Joseph T.	Sisson, Luther B.
Carr, Herbert W.	Fisher, James R. M., II	Jennings, Verne H., Jr.	Muncie, Maurice O.	Slaton, Robert W.	Slaton, Robert W.
Carr, Kenneth M.	Fiske, Clarence O.	Jensen, William G.	Munnikhuisen, Henry F.	Slonim, Charles E.	Small, William N.
Carroll, Kent J.	Fogarty, Francis C.	Jessen, George E.	Murray, James D., Jr.	Smith, Deming W.	Smith, Donald A.
Carter, Jack L.	Fortson, Thomas E.	Jex, Donald R.	Murrill, Robert L.	Smith, George E.	Smith, John C.
Casserly, Christopher J.	Foster, William L.	Johnson, Francis A.	Myers, William A., III	Smith, John A.	Smith, Ralph F.
Chamberlain, Raymond E., Jr.	Foust, James W.	Johnson, John R.	Navarrette, Claude, Jr.	Smith, Robert S.	Smith, Robert H., Jr.
Chapman, James H.	Foxgrover, James H.	Johnson, John D., Jr.	Neal, William G.	Soderholm, Carlton E.	Soper, Malvern E.
Chattleton, William D.	Franz, Donald A.	Johnson, Theodore R., Jr.	Negele, John H., Jr.		
Chelgren, John L.	Fraser, Walter R.	Jones, Allen, Jr.	Nelson, Clifford		
Chelgren, Robert P.	Freeland, Harold H.	Karlowski, Mitchell J.	Nelson, Perry W.		
Chrisler, Robert P.	Fritz, Charles W.	Karnagel, Donald T.	Netherland, Roger M.		
Christoph, Karl J., Jr.	Fritz, Ernest S.	Keenan, Paul C., Jr.	Newcomb, Robert C.		
Clark, Carroll D.	Frost, Richard A.	Keener, Bruce, III	Newsome, William R.		
Clark, William E.	Fuller, Jack D.	Keller, William F., Jr.	Nivison, William		
Clay, Harold S.	Gallagher, Joseph	Kelly, Eugene F.	Nordberg, Delbert W.		
Clement, Robert R.	Gammon, James M.	Kelly, Merrill E., Jr.	Nuss, Jerry J.		
Clemente, Angelo E.	Gardiner, Richard S.	Kern, John S.	O'Callaghan, Edmund W.		
Clifford, William F., Jr.	Garlinghouse, Bruce B.	Kinnear, George E. R., II	Olivari, Louis		
Cocke, Edgar M.	Gary, Stanley P.	Kirk, George G. E.	O'Neill, Thomas H. R.		
Cole, Kenneth J.	Gauthier, Gene F.	Kiser, Charles A.	Orton, Robert D.		
Coleman, Robert G., Jr.	Gay, William W.	Kleczewski, Marion J.	Osborn, Neri, III		
Comet, Robert E.	Geary, John T.	Klein, Melvin E.	Osmer, James W., Jr.		
Conn, Robert H.	Geary, Joseph R.	Kneuen, William H.			
Constantine, James R.	Geiger, Robert K.	Knutson, Albert E.			
Coppedge, John O.		Koehler, Robert H.			
Corley, Frank W., Jr.		Kojm, Leonard R.			
Corrigan, Paul T.		Korb, Frank J.			
Cort, Walter W., Jr.		Kosnik, Joseph T.			
Counts, Stanley T.					



## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, September 27, 1967:

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

John F. Kincaid, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

## FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Paul Rand Dixon, of Tennessee, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1967.

## FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Carl E. Bagge, of Illinois, to be a member

of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 22, 1972.

## CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

G. Joseph Minetti, of New York, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1973.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## The Kee Report: Peace Corps

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report."

The subject discussed in this report is the Peace Corps and the accomplishments being made by this organization.

This is Jim Kee—bringing you the Kee report.

Nearly 15,000 young Americans are working abroad this summer to give a helping hand to the world's most destitute people. These are the volunteers serving in the Peace Corps, an agency sponsored six years ago by the late President Kennedy.

When this novel organization first started, it was viewed with toleration and skepticism. Everyone wished it well but there was a widespread feeling that youngsters just off the college campus were hardly equipped to help the millions of ill-clad, ill-housed and ill-fed natives of the earth's backward areas. There was a companion feeling that eager volunteers might give offense by mixing too freely in local affairs.

Five years of successful operation have convinced the doubters. But, while just about everyone has a kindly feeling for the Peace Corps, the public is still pretty much in the dark about its actual operations. So let us take a look at what these youngsters are doing in far-off places.

Slightly more than half are engaged in teaching. There is a widespread need for English teachers in the fifty-three countries served by the Corps. Many volunteers teach other foreign languages. In countries where illiteracy is common, the Peace Corps is reaching an estimated half a million adults and children through educational television beamed into schools and community centers.

Nearly one-third are working in rural and urban community projects. This means they are helping to develop those health and food-growing projects which are so desperately needed where the most of the people live in poverty.

It may seem puzzling that volunteers with only two or three months training are competent to act in those fields where specialized training is usually necessary. But the fact is that these eager-beaver youngsters have done amazingly well at mastering the practical jobs which comprise most of their work.

Experience has shown that the expert is too often frustrated in primitive surroundings. To explain this, it may be pointed out that ten of the world's greatest surgeons would be of less help in a native village than ten young ladies properly trained in first-aid relief work. The main job is to heal the cuts and bruises of every-day life and to teach the basic facts of sanitation.

The Peace Corps is looked upon as primarily an organization of young people, which it is. But older volunteers are given a hearty welcome when they have skills which are urgently needed in the field. This is especially true in agriculture and allied pursuits because increasing the food yield is so important in backward areas.

India, where the food shortage is reaching crisis proportions, is a Peace Corps priority. One project designed to increase the poultry yield has worked out better than expected and similar projects are now getting underway.

The volunteers are taught to live simply so as not to offend the poor people among whom they work. This means a standard of living below what they were accustomed to in our country.

The Peace Corps may be described as an experiment in the idealism of American youth. I am happy to report that so far it has worked out very well.

Thank you for listening.

## President Johnson's Remarks in Signing Food Stamp Bill Into Law

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 27, 1967

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, the bright sun which shone on the rose garden at the White House at noon today signaled a bright new prospect for health and well-being for an estimated 1,200,000 additional Americans who should be able to share in the advantages of the food stamp program as a result of the President's signing today of Public Law 90-91. The new law authorizes appropriations of up to \$200,000,000 for the 1968 fiscal year, and up to \$225,000,000 for the 1969 fiscal year, to continue the food stamp program initiated on a very small pilot basis in eight areas of the country 6 years ago.

The program is now operating on an annual rate basis of \$160,000,000, with nearly 2 million participants, so that the new authorization, if followed by appropriation of the funds budgeted for the current fiscal year, will make possible an expansion of about 600,000 persons this year. A similar expansion of 600,000 could take place in the following year if the authorized funds are appropriated. Boston, New York, and some of the other cities not yet in the program should be able to come in during the present year or soon thereafter. I certainly hope they do enter this successful program. I hope the plan can also be put into effect in other areas of Missouri than just St. Louis.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the remarks made by President Johnson this noon in signing Public Law 90-91, as follows:

## REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON SIGNING THE FOOD STAMP ACT, SEPTEMBER 27, 1967

Good morning ladies and gentlemen, Senator Alken, Senator Byrd, Senator Ellender, Senator Boggs, Chairman Poage, Congresswoman Sullivan, Congressman Purcell, and the other members of the House and Senate who I did not get recorded here:

I welcome one and all of you for the good work that you have done. I think we all share the common view that we want no American in this country to ever go hungry. We believe that we have the knowledge, the compassion, and the resources to banish hunger and to do away with malnutrition, if we will only apply those resources and those energies.

The bill that I have asked you to be here with me when I sign puts some of that abundance into the reach of the people of America.

Under the Food Stamp Program a low-income family can take what little money it has for food and purchase food stamps. At the neighborhood grocery these are worth more than they cost. The difference is made up by the Federal Government.

Food stamps are not the only weapon in the assault on hunger. The Food Stamp Act was passed three years ago. In that time, the program has expanded from 43 pilot areas in 23 States to 838 areas in 41 States. Today it is helping to feed nearly 2 million needy Americans. This extension will enable us to do still more.

We have nearly 20 million school children—more than ever before—receiving low cost or free meals under the School Lunch Program. That program today is in its 21st year.

More than 100,000 children have a better chance to learn because they began their day with a decent breakfast because of the Child Nutrition Act that we passed in 1966.

Three-million needy Americans in family units are receiving better diets in the Commodity Donation Program of the Department of Agriculture.

As I sign this Act, I am asking the Secretary to help America's 300 poorest counties which do not now have food assistance to start a Community Distribution Program to be available for the low-income families.

We are all mindful that the poor need more than food. The causes of poverty are complex. The answers to poverty are very difficult. The escape from poverty is not going to come soon, but we must all continue to try the best way that we can to give all that we can to banish poverty from our land.

Poverty's cruellest wound is hunger. The Act that we will sign today, I think, will do some little something to relieve some of that hunger.

To those men and women in the House and Senate who have had the vision to help us prepare this bill by the long drawn out hearings and the days in conference, and the debates on the floor, we owe them all a debt of gratitude which I want to acknowledge on behalf of the American people.